

# The Review of English Studies

---

VOL. XIV.—No. 53.

JANUARY, 1938.

---

## THE TWO ACCOUNTS OF THE ASSUMPTION IN BLICKLING HOMILY XIII

BY RUDOLPH WILLARD

THE apocryphal narratives of the Assumption of the Virgin Mary<sup>1</sup> may be divided into two types, in accordance with their explanation of the manner in which she is taken up into heaven. These may be described as translation and resurrection texts respectively. The former relate that, after Mary's body had been laid in the tomb, it was borne to heaven by a chariot of light or clouds of light, and was placed under the Tree of Life. There it was reunited to its soul, that she might thenceforth enjoy in anticipation that life in heaven which mankind is to experience after the Last Judgment.<sup>2</sup> In the resurrection stories, on the other hand, after the burial of the Virgin, Christ appeared at the tomb and raised her body from the grave,

<sup>1</sup> For a convenient collection of Assumption texts, see Montague Rhodes James, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, Oxford, 1924, pp. 194-227.

<sup>2</sup> Of the texts given by James, *Apocryphal New Testament*, the following are of the translation type: Coptic: Pseudo-Evodius, p. 196; Greek: Pseudo-John the Evangelist, p. 209; Latin: Pseudo-Joseph of Arimathea (*Transitus A*), p. 217; Syriac: 1, p. 221; 2a, p. 222; 3, p. 223; 4, p. 225; Irish: *Liber Flavius Fergusiorum*, p. 225, note 1. See below, p. 4, note 1. With these might be included the Discourse of Cyril of Jerusalem, in Sahidic, James, p. 198: Mary's body is mysteriously taken away and laid up incorruptible until the Last Day, when, presumably, in common with the rest of humanity, it will regain its soul and become a living being.

much as He raised that of Lazarus. Her soul, which had been brought back by the psychopomp angel, then re-entered the body, and Mary was again a living entity. Thereupon she was taken up to heaven, where she lives ever-blessed.<sup>1</sup>

It is apparent from this analysis that these two types are in disagreement as to how the Assumption was accomplished.

Although texts of the translation type are the more widely distributed and represent, perhaps, the original story, they do not appear to have been the best known in the West. There it is the resurrection narrative which seems to have enjoyed the greatest vogue, as one may gather from the numerous manuscripts, both Latin and vernacular, of its representatives, the Pseudo-Melito version and the first text of the *Legenda Aurea*.

Recent publications have added two very important bodies of material to the literature of the Assumption, particularly through the researches of Wilmart and Jugie. In 1933 Dom André Wilmart published, with variant readings from nine manuscripts, a Latin account of the Assumption<sup>2</sup> which, he held, was older than the well-known Pseudo-Melito, or *Transitus Mariae B*.<sup>3</sup> Wilmart's text I refer to hereafter as *Transitus C*.<sup>3</sup>

For a decade and more prior to the appearance of Wilmart's Latin text, Père Martin Jugie had been producing a number of very important studies on the Greek literature of the Virgin Mary, and he published much material either not before in print or generally

<sup>1</sup> The resurrection accounts in James are the following: Coptic: Theodosius, p. 199, Revillout's text, p. 200; Latin: Pseudo-Melito (*Transitus B*), p. 215. To these may be added the first story in the literature for the Assumption in the *Legenda Aurea*, which I call *Transitus E*; see below, p. 8.

<sup>2</sup> *Analecta Reginensia*, (*Studi e Testi* LIX), Città del Vaticano, 1933, pp. 323-57; "L'Ancien Récit Latin de l'Assomption." See also Rudolph Willard, "On Blickling Homily XIII: *The Assumption of the Virgin*," in *The Review of English Studies*, XII, 1936, pp. 7-8.

<sup>3</sup> I do so because Tischendorf designated his two Latin Assumption texts as *Transitus Mariae A* and *Transitus Mariae B*. These latter texts are often referred to as *Transitus A* and *Transitus B* respectively. It is convenient, indeed, to keep this designation and to use *Transitus* for a Latin and *Koimesis* for a Greek narrative of the Death and Assumption of the Virgin.

The five principal Latin redactions are the following: *Transitus A*, *Apocalypses Apocryphae*, pp. 113-23; *Transitus B*, *ibid.*, pp. 124-36; *Transitus C*, *Analecta Reginensia*, pp. 325-57; *Transitus D*, *ibid.*, pp. 357-62: this is a Latin translation of Tischendorf's *Koimesis* (*Apocalypses Apocryphae*, pp. 95-112); *Transitus E*, the first piece for the Assumption in the *Legenda Aurea*. My reference to this text, *R.E.S.*, XII, 1936, p. 4, is faulty; line 15 should read thus: "*Apocryphae*, pp. xliii-xlvi, and A. M. Ceriani reproduced in facsimile the text and the interesting accompanying illuminations," etc. I hope in the near future to write on the Assumption texts in the *Legenda Aurea* in the light of the recent studies of Dom Wilmart and Père Jugie.

inaccessible or previously neglected.<sup>1</sup> Much dealt with the Assumption.<sup>2</sup> Jugie called attention to a Greek discourse on the Koimesis, or the Falling Asleep, of Mary, compiled by John Archbishop of Thessalonika, who died about 630.<sup>3</sup> This had been cited by Tischendorf in the *prolegomena* to his *Apocalypses Apocryphae*,<sup>4</sup> and Montague Rhodes James had summarized in his *Apocryphal New Testament* the few excerpts from the Greek that Tischendorf had printed.<sup>5</sup> In 1926 Jugie published in full the Greek of John of Thessalonika, accompanying it with a Latin translation; in fact, he printed two texts, the primitive and the interpolated, as he termed them.<sup>6</sup>

That Wilmart was aware of Jugie's work and realized its importance is evident from his citation<sup>7</sup> in a footnote of certain of the latter's studies, though he made no use of John of Thessalonika in his edition of *Transitus C*, since his immediate concern was the Latin text of that redaction. It was reserved for Professor Jean Rivière of Strasbourg to synthesize the work of Wilmart and of Jugie and to demonstrate in detail the essential identity of *Transitus C* with the Koimesis of John of Thessalonika.<sup>8</sup> Rivière showed, as his title indicates, that the Greek was akin not to *Transitus B*, as Jugie had previously argued,<sup>9</sup> but rather to *Transitus C*, which Wilmart had just made public. It was Rivière's opinion that it was *Transitus C* which had served John of Thessalonika as the

<sup>1</sup> An extensive collection is given in his *Homélies Mariales Byzantines* in *Patrologia Orientalis*, xvi, Paris, 1922, pp. 425-589, and xix, 1926, pp. 287-526.

<sup>2</sup> In particular, "La Morte et l'Assomption de la Sainte Vierge dans la Tradition des Cinq Premiers Siècles," in *Échos d'Orient*, xxv, 1926, pp. 5-11, 128-43, and 281-308, and its sequel, "La Littérature Apocryphe sur la Mort et l'Assomption de Marie à partir de la Seconde Moitié du vi<sup>e</sup> Siècle," in *Échos d'Orient*, xxix, 1930, pp. 265-95.

<sup>3</sup> "La Vie et les Œuvres de Jean de Thessalonique : Son Témoignage sur les Origines de la Fête de l'Assomption et sur la Primauté de Saint Pierre," in *Échos d'Orient*, xxi, 1922, pp. 293-307, and "Analyse du Discours de Jean de Thessalonique sur la Dormition de la Sainte Vierge," in *Échos d'Orient*, xxii, 1923, pp. 385-97. Both these are substantially reproduced in the introduction to his text of the Koimesis of John of Thessalonika, *Patrologia Orientalis*, xix, 344 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Pp. xxxviii-xlii.

<sup>5</sup> *Apocryphal New Testament*, p. 209.

<sup>6</sup> *Patrologia Orientalis*, xix, 344-438.

<sup>7</sup> *Analecta Reginensia*, p. 323, note 1; he cites *Échos d'Orient*, 1922, pp. 298-307; 1923, pp. 385-97; 1926, pp. 300-305; 1930, pp. 265-95. For the first two, see above, note 3; for the other two, note 2.

<sup>8</sup> "Le plus Vieux *Transitus* Latin et son Dérivé Grec," in *Recherches de Théologie Ancienne et Médiévale*, viii, 1936, pp. 5-23.

<sup>9</sup> At that time Jugie knew, of the Latin texts, only *Transitus A* and *Transitus B*. He held that the Koimesis of John of Thessalonika was an amplification of *Transitus B* and, in certain places, a correction of it: *Patrologia Orientalis*, xix, 370-72.

source of his Koimesis, since many features of Transitus C which are not to be found in Transitus B appear in an expanded form in the Koimesis. I believe, however, that the kinship between Transitus C and the Koimesis is not that of source and derivative, respectively, but rather a cognate relationship. The reasons for this I set forth in a study on the Irish account of the Assumption in the *Liber Flavus Fergusiorum*.<sup>1</sup>

The popularity of both Transitus C and the Koimesis of John of Thessalonika is attested by the number of manuscripts of each that have come down to us: ten Latin manuscripts of the one and some sixteen Greek of the other. It is here to be noted that much material from the tradition represented by these two texts is preserved also in one of the pieces of Assumption literature in the *Legenda Aurea*,<sup>2</sup> thereby increasing the dissemination in the West of Assumption narratives of the translation type.

Old English literature is not without its representative of the translation type, though the peculiar character of the extant texts has disguised this fact. That Blickling Homily XIII<sup>3</sup> is an Assumption text is instantly recognizable. That it bears some relationship to Transitus B, the best-known Latin redaction, was, of course, readily recognized; but the many differences between Transitus B and the Blickling Homily make it impossible to use that Latin version in solving the difficulties of the Old English. The publication of Transitus C by Dom Wilmart has supplied us at last with the source of the Old English,<sup>4</sup> and a careful comparison of the one with the other permits us in many cases to understand what has gone wrong with the Blickling translation. It is now apparent that, except for its startling vagaries, the Old English is, in the main, faithful in following its source, a fact unexpected from the present bewildering version as seen in the Blickling Homily. Thanks to Wilmart's critical edition, we can now see that the unbelievably garbled state of the Old English is to be explained by

<sup>1</sup> Forthcoming in *Recherches de Théologie Ancienne et Médiévale*. For a summary of the Irish, see St. John D. Seymour, "Irish Versions of the Transitus Mariae," in *The Journal of Theological Studies*, xxiii, 1921-1922, pp. 36-43. See also James, *Apocryphal Testament*, pp. 225-6.

<sup>2</sup> See, for instance, Caxton's English translation: *The Golden Legend, or Lives of the Saints, as Englished by William Caxton*, London, J. M. Dent, 1900, iv. 254-61.

<sup>3</sup> Richard Morris, *The Blickling Homilies of the Tenth Century* (Early English Text Society, LVIII, LXIII, and LXXVIII), London, 1874-1880, pp. 136-59.

<sup>4</sup> See Rudolph Willard, "On Blickling Homily XIII: *The Assumption of the Virgin*," in *R.E.S.*, xii, 1936, pp. 1-17.



three factors: (1) that the translator was working from a faulty Latin copy; (2) that his latinity was feeble; and (3) that, after its completion, the vernacular text was emended and improved, at times out of all intelligibility.<sup>1</sup>

Although *Transitus C* is the chief source of Blickling Homily XIII, it is not its sole source, for the Old English version is clearly of the resurrection rather than of the translation type. A very little examination, however, reveals it to be both: it is, in fact, a compound text. Following its primary source, *Transitus C*, the Old English relates in summary fashion Christ's advent at the tomb on the third day of watching, His command to Michael to bear Mary's body into the clouds, and the assumption of the Apostles, who also were borne away in clouds. All were then transported miraculously to Paradise and the Virgin's body was placed under the Tree of Life, where it is glorifying God with all His elect.<sup>2</sup> Here the Old English takes leave of *Transitus C* and begins to follow a resurrection narrative. But in so doing, it goes back to the moment on the third day after the deposition,<sup>3</sup> when Christ returns for the Assumption, and it relates in great detail His advent, His words with the Apostles, their request to Him concerning His mother, the resurrection of Mary's body from the grave, the return of her soul, and, finally, the Assumption itself. The fact that *Transitus C* was taken as the source to so great an extent is to be explained, perhaps, because it lay conveniently at hand, but more probably because of its very circumstantial account of Mary's death and of the events preceding it. Its treatment of the Assumption, however, could hardly have satisfied the translator, so meagre was it in comparison with its record of what had gone before. The desire for equal fullness with regard to the Assumption also must have led to the choice of another and fuller description of that event and to the use of a narrative, not yet fully identified, which, in its copiousness of detail at this point, did justice to the mystery of Mary's taking up in the body into the life to come. By joining this new narrative to *Transitus C*, the redactor attained a story of equal richness throughout, from the annunciation of death to Mary's reception into Paradise. As a suitable conclusion to his expanded recital, he then added the *Magnificat*, in a slightly *farci* version, to

<sup>1</sup> These facts are abundantly illustrated in the notes to the *passus* from Blickling Homily XIII that I present below, pp. 9-19.

<sup>2</sup> See below, pp. 9-10, sections 47-50.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 10, 51. 1.

serve as a hymn in her honour, whose glorious passing from this world he had just commemorated.<sup>1</sup>

It is readily seen that this greater fullness of detail has been attained at the cost of including contradictory elements, since, in the mechanics of the Assumption, the translation and the resurrection narratives are mutually incompatible. In any union of these two, those details of the first which are to be contradicted by the action described in the second should be eliminated before the new source is spliced on. A skilful joiner would have dropped *Transitus C* with the account of the deposition in the tomb and of the watch kept there by the Apostles.<sup>2</sup> He would then be free to take up his new story and continue with the account of Christ's advent and of the Assumption. But this he failed to do. Instead, before he left *Transitus C* he continued past the mention of the watch at the tomb, even to record Christ's coming and the translation of Mary's body to heaven. Then, in taking up his new source, he went back to Christ's coming for the Assumption, and he told the story over again according to the supplementary source, with the result that Christ is made to appear at the tomb twice on this day and Mary's body is twice taken up to heaven. But the absurdity of this was apparent to the joiner, for in that passage which he still retained from *Transitus C* and which he failed to eliminate he altered the word "body" to "soul,"<sup>3</sup> so that it is only Mary's soul that is taken to heaven at Christ's first appearance on this occasion, and her body at the second. But in solving one difficulty he raised another, that of the double transport of Mary's soul to heaven: the first, and properly, at her death, and this second three days later, at what should have been the time of her Assumption on the very day when, in fact, the soul must be brought back from heaven that it may rejoin its body.<sup>4</sup> Now, in the death scene *Transitus C* fails to state specifically that, after Mary's soul had come forth from the body and had been entrusted by Christ to Michael, it was actually borne to heaven. Presumably it was taken as a matter of course that this was what happened. What else would the psychopomp angel have done with the soul? There was, it is true, a belief current to the effect that the soul did not make its way to the other world until the third day after death, but that it tarried about its body until the time came for it to bid its body farewell on the third day.<sup>5</sup> It is

<sup>1</sup> *Blickling Homilies*, pp. 157-9.    <sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 155, line 9; see below, p. 9, 47. 2.

<sup>3</sup> See below, p. 9, 48.

<sup>4</sup> See below, p. 15, 54. 2.

<sup>5</sup> See Rudolph Willard, *Two Apocrypha in Old English Homilies* (*Beiträge*

undoubtedly this belief which, at bottom, is responsible for the setting of the Assumption on the third day after Mary's death: when on that day her soul was to go to the realm of souls, it went up clothed in its mortal body, now become immortal. But I do not believe that, for the joiner of *Transitus C* and the new source, any such considerations operated to make him retain that fragment of the first which conflicted with the second source. I believe that for him, as for the writers of the other recensions of the Assumption narrative, Mary's soul was taken at death to the abode of souls, where it remained until the time of its restoration to her body, be it in Paradise, as in the translation accounts, or at the grave, as in the resurrection stories. In the latter type it must, indeed, be brought back by the psychopomp angel. In the Coptic texts a long space of time intervened between Mary's death and her resurrection, some two hundred days, a period sufficient to ensure the complete decay of her earthly body. The object of this was to combat Docetic doctrine, by asserting thus the physical reality of Mary's body, and to show that it was no apparition or seeming body. It is the body once thoroughly decomposed but now thoroughly resurrected that is rejoined by the soul at her Assumption. In the interval between her death and Assumption, her soul must have tarried in the habitations of the righteous. I believe that, for the Old English translator also, Mary's soul was in Paradise during the interval between her death and her Assumption. It might be pointed out in this connection that the scribe of one of the variant manuscripts of *Transitus C*, after the statement that at Mary's death Christ gave her soul into Michael's hands, went on to add *ut eam in caelum saluam perducatur*: "that he might carry it safe into heaven."<sup>1</sup> The present state of Blickling, then, is best explained as resulting from a clumsy union of two conflicting versions of the Assumption, and the alteration of "body" into "soul"<sup>2</sup> in the last lines from *Transitus C* as an effort to avoid the awkwardness and inconsistency resulting from his method, even though it raised a new difficulty with regard to a double translation of Mary's soul to heaven.

The new resurrection passage with which the Old English *zur Englischen Philologie*, xxx), Leipzig, 1935, pp. 127-8, and Emil Freistedt, *Altchristliche Totengedächtnistage und ihre Beziehung zum Jenseitsglauben und Totenkultus der Antike* (Liturgiegeschichtliche Quellen und Forschungen, xxiv), Münster, 1928, pp. 61-2.

<sup>1</sup> *Analecta Reginensia*, p. 344, chapter 26, variant reading MS. R.

<sup>2</sup> See below, p. 9, 49.

completes *Transitus C* resembles very much the corresponding *passus* in *Transitus B*, though it is not entirely that version. *Transitus B* was, in fact, known in Anglo-Saxon England, for we have a faithful translation of it into the vernacular in one of the marginal homilies of MS. 41 of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.<sup>1</sup> For certain details of the Blickling resurrection narrative we must turn for analogues not to *Transitus B* but to *Transitus E*, that version which forms the opening piece of the Assumption literature of the *Legenda Aurea*. Neither *Transitus B* nor *Transitus E* alone supplies all the details, but together they seem to. If the translator did not work from both *Transitus B* and *Transitus E*, he must have had a text which was related to both of these latter two, though neither of them as we know them.<sup>2</sup>

In the remainder of this study I shall set the Latin and Old English in parallel columns, since by so doing it is possible not only to reveal the sources of the Blickling material but also to show how the translator handled his original. This procedure will enable one to gain some idea of the peculiar nature of the Blickling Homily as a whole. In the notes I attempt to explain a number of the difficulties encountered in that text. *Transitus B* I reprint from Tischendorf's *Apocalypses Apocryphae* and *Transitus C* from Wilmart's *Analecta Reginensia*. *Transitus E* I give from MS. L 58 of the Bibliotheca Ambrosiana, Milan. In *Transitus C* I observe Wilmart's division into chapter and verse, and I continue the system throughout the remainder of Blickling Homily XIII. For the numbering after chapter 50, I myself am responsible. I have taken some liberty with the punctuation, in the interest of uniformity of usage. In the Old English I substitute 7 for the & which Morris used to represent the scribal abbreviation of the conjunction "and." That the nature of the union of *Transitus C* and the resurrection narrative may be fully evident, I begin with chapter 47, the deposition of Mary's body in the tomb. Occasionally I cite readings from certain of the variant manuscripts. The manuscripts of *Transitus B* are listed in *Apocalypses Apocryphae*, p. xliii; and for *Transitus C* see above, p. 2, note 3.

<sup>1</sup> Pp. 280-87. This homily is as yet unpublished; I am preparing it for publication.

<sup>2</sup> The relation of the various *Transitus* to each other and, indeed, the whole problem of the Latin texts of the Assumption, need urgently the ministrations of a Theodore Silverstein to do for it what he did for the *Apocalypse of Paul*; see his "Visio Sancti Pauli," *Studies and Documents*, IV, London, 1935.

## Blickling

47. 1 Ond þa witodlice þa apostolas bæron Marian lichoman<sup>1</sup> oppæt<sup>2</sup> hie coman to þære byrgenne þær Drihten him be-bead,<sup>3</sup> 7 hie þa þær bebyrigdon Marian lichoman,  
2 7 þa setton hie æt<sup>4</sup> þære byrgenne dura swa swa Drihten Hælende Crist him bebead.

3 7 þa him swa sittendum þa com þær semninga ure Drihten mid mycclre mengeo engla, 7 cwæp to him, "Sib sy, broþor, mid eow."

48 7 he þa bebead Michaele þær heahengle þæt he onfenge þære eadigan Marian sawle<sup>5</sup> mid<sup>6</sup> wolcnum;

49. 1 7 þa onfeng<sup>7</sup> Michael þære saule.<sup>8</sup> Ond he<sup>9</sup> þa cwæp to þær apostolum oppæt hie ealle genealahton

## Transitus C

47. 1 Mariam<sup>1</sup> autem portantes apostoli peruenerunt<sup>2</sup> ad monumentum,<sup>3</sup> ubi eam sepelierunt.

2 Ipsi uero resederunt ante<sup>4</sup> ostium monumenti, sicut mandauerat illis dominus Iesus Christus.

3 Et sedentibus illis, subito aduenit dominus cum multitudine angelorum, et ait ad eos, "Pax uobis, fratres."

48 Et si ciussit Michaheli archangelo ut susciperet corpus<sup>5</sup> beatae Mariae in<sup>6</sup> nubibus.

49. 1 Et cum suscepisset,<sup>7</sup> dixit dominus<sup>9</sup> ad apostolos ut accederent<sup>10</sup> prope se.

<sup>1</sup> Instead of the simple *Mariam*, as in L, variant MS. F has *corpus . . . Mariae* to which corresponds the *Marian lichoman* of Blickling.

<sup>2</sup> *Oppæt hie comon* of Blickling must repose on a reading like the *donec peruenerunt* of MS. F, rather than the simple *peruenerunt* of L.

<sup>3</sup> *To þære byrgenne þær Drihten him bebead* suggests a Latin source which at this point must have had some phrase like *sicut* (or *ubi*) *mandauerat illis dominus*, under the influence, perhaps, of the next verse. It is to be observed that MS. V, instead of *ad monumentum* (as in L), reads *ad locum quem dixerat Ihesus et inuenerunt monumentum*.

<sup>4</sup> Perhaps the source read *ad*, instead of *ante*, *ostium*.

<sup>5</sup> Where the Latin reads *corpus*, Blickling has *sawle*. On this substitution of "soul" for "body," see above, p. 6.

<sup>6</sup> Probably *in* was missing in the source. The simple *nubibus* could easily be taken as an ablative of means or instrument, as the translator has apparently done: *mid wolcnum*, Blickling. Cf. *on wolcnum*, in 49. 2, which renders correctly *in nubibus* of the Latin.

<sup>7</sup> The subordinate and temporal character of *cum suscepisset* seems to have been lost on the Old English translator, who has treated it as though it were a perfect indicative, *suscepit*, as his *onfeng* shows.

<sup>8</sup> *Sawle* is supplied, probably by the translator, as an object for *onfeng*. Actually, the proper object of *suscepisset* is *corpus*; cf. above, note 5.

<sup>9</sup> *Dominus* must have been missing in the Latin source; its absence there would deprive *dixit* of its proper subject. In such a case Michael would be understood, as the translator has actually done here.

<sup>10</sup> *Accederent prope se* is not translated in the Old English, and probably was missing in the source.

## Blickling

- 2 to Drihtne Hælendum Criste;  
 ond þonne þære sawle<sup>1</sup> onfeng  
 on wolcnum.
50. 1 7 Drihten bead þæm wolc-  
 num þæt hie eodan on neorxna-  
 wang,  
 2 7 þær asetton þære eadigan  
 Marian sawle<sup>2</sup>; 7 on neorxa-  
 wange biþ a wuldor<sup>4</sup> mid Gode<sup>4</sup>  
 7 mid eallum his gecorenum  
 soþlice.

## Transitus C

- 2 Et cum adpropinquassent  
 apostoli ad dominum Iesum, et  
 ipsi<sup>1</sup> suscepti sunt in nubibus.
50. 1 Et praecepit dominus nubi-  
 bus ut irent in paradiso sub  
 arbore uitae.<sup>2</sup>  
 2 Et sic deposuerunt nubes  
 corpus<sup>3</sup> beatae Mariae in para-  
 diso,<sup>3</sup> et est ibi glorificans<sup>4</sup>  
 deum<sup>4</sup> omnibus electis suis.
- 3 Et<sup>5</sup> adtulerunt angeli animam  
 sanctae Mariae et posuerunt eam  
 in corpore ipsius, iubente domino  
 nostro Iesu Christo, et habebit  
 gloriam ibi in sempiterna saecula  
 saeculorum amen.
- 4 Tunc percepit dominus re-  
 stituere apostolos unumquemque  
 unde assumpti fuerant.<sup>5</sup>

Transitus E<sup>6</sup>

51. 1 Ond þa soþlice set þære  
 þriddan tide þæs dæges, þa com
51. 1 Tertia autem die veniens  
 Ihesus cum multitudine ange-

<sup>1</sup> The meaning of the passage has not been understood by the translator. He failed to see that it was the Apostles themselves who were now taken up into the clouds to accompany Mary's body as it was borne to Paradise. *Sawle* has no place here; see above, p. 9, note 8.

<sup>2</sup> *Sub arbore uitae* is missing in the Old English and in most of the variant Latin manuscripts; only MSS. R and S (and V in a different form) include it. It is, however, probably an original feature, since it occurs in our oldest Syriac version (see William Wright, *Contributions to the Apocryphal Literature of the New Testament*, London, 1865, p. 47), and also in the Irish.

<sup>3</sup> Again *corpus* is altered to read "soul" in the Old English; see above, p. 9, note 5.

<sup>4</sup> In *paradiso*, instead of being taken with *deposuerunt*, which it properly modifies, is construed in Blickling with the clause which follows; *glorificans*, instead of being rendered as a participle modifying *corpus* (or *animam* which has been substituted for it, see preceding note), as in the Latin, or possibly even Mary, understood, is in the Old English taken as though it were *gloria est* or something similar: hence the reading, *biþ a wuldor*. *Deum*, instead of being taken as the object of *glorificans*, is made into a prepositional phrase parallel to *omnibus electis*! Possibly the abbreviated form *deū* has been mistaken for *deo*; hence, *mid Gode*.

<sup>5</sup> The last two verses of Transitus C are missing in Blickling, probably because they could not be fitted into the new conclusion which was about to be added on: it is not yet time either to restore Mary's soul to her body or to return the Apostles each to his own preaching station.

<sup>6</sup> The resurrection text followed in the Old English (see above, p. 8), is evidently like Transitus E at this point, and not like Transitus B. I give both so that the comparison may be made.



## Blickling

þær Drihten mid myclum  
[engla]<sup>1</sup> menigeo, 7 halette þa  
apostolas, 7 wæs cweþende, "Sib  
sy mid eow, broþor."

2 7 þa answeredan him þa  
apostolas, 7 hie cwædon,  
"Wuldor þe sy, God, forþon  
þe<sup>2</sup> þu dydest ana mycel  
wuldor."

## Transitus E

lorum, ipsos salutauit,icens,  
"Pax vobis."

2 Qui responderunt, "Gloria  
tibi, Deus, qui<sup>2</sup> facis mirabilia  
magna solus."

Transitus B<sup>3</sup>

51. 1 Et ecce subito advenit dominus Iesus Christus cum magna  
multitudine angelorum, magnae  
claritatis radio coruscante, et  
dixit apostolis, "Pax vobiscum."  
2 At illi respondentes dixerunt,  
"Fiat misericordia tua, domine,  
super nos, sicut speravimus in  
te."

Transitus B<sup>4</sup>

52. 1 Þa cwæp ure Hælend to  
him, "Ær ic wæs sended fram  
minum Fæder,<sup>5</sup> to þæm þæt ic

52. 1 Tunc salvator locutus est  
eisicens, "Antequam ascen-  
derem ad patrem meum,<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Engla is missing in Blickling; I supply it from variant MS. CCCC 198.

<sup>2</sup> Perhaps *qui* has been read as though it were *quia*; at any rate it is so rendered.

<sup>3</sup> See p. 10, note 6.

<sup>4</sup> For chapter 52 the source is best represented by Transitus B. In the Old English translation of this passus in MS. CCCC 41, p. 286, the text runs as follows:

Cwæð him Hælend to, "Hwæt, la! þa ic lichomlice mid eow wæs, ic eow gehet, þe me fylgende wæron, mid þy þe he [*mannes sumu, not in MS.*] sitte on þam dome ofer ðam setle mines mægenþrimmes, ge sittað ofer twelf heahsetlum, demende twelf Israela mægðe. 7 þa sona of Israhela mægðe ic geceas, for ðon þe hio fæmne þuruhwunude æfter þam beorðre, 7 fæmne hio wæs ær ðam beorðre, 7 nu þone gedafenan ende hire lifes hio gefilde. Hwæt willað ge hwæt ic hire do?"

This explanation belongs, then, to the tradition of Transitus B. Its ultimate source is Matt. xix. 28: "And Jesus said unto them, 'Verily I say unto you, that ye which have followed me, in the regeneration, when the Son of Man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.'" (cf. below, 52. 2-4). Transitus E offers nothing here. In that version Christ merely asks the Apostles what honour they wish him to confer on His mother; see below, 53. 1.

<sup>5</sup> Ær ic wæs sended fram minum Fæder of Blickling is the exact opposite of *Antequam ascenderem ad patrem meum* of the Latin. This is not the first time that the Old English appears to reverse the meaning of its source.

## Blickling

sceolde gefyllan mine þa halgan  
prowunge<sup>1</sup>;

2 ond ic þa was gehwyrfed on  
minne lichoman,<sup>2</sup> swa<sup>3</sup> ic eow  
ær gehet, 7 on eallum þæm þe<sup>4</sup>  
me fylgende wæron on þissum  
menniscan cynne,<sup>5</sup>

3 7 ic was sittende<sup>6</sup> ofer manna  
bearnum on minum mægen-  
þrymme; ond was sittende ofer  
eow on minum<sup>7</sup> hehsetle; 7  
ic demde<sup>8</sup> twelf peodum on  
prim<sup>9</sup> Israhela folcum.

## Transitus B

2 pollicitus sum<sup>1</sup> vobis dicens,<sup>4</sup>  
quod vos, qui secuti estis me in  
regeneratione,<sup>5</sup>

3 cum<sup>6</sup> sederit filius hominis  
in sede maiestatis suae, sedebitis  
et vos super thronos duodecim,<sup>7</sup>  
iudicantes<sup>8</sup> duodecim tribus<sup>9</sup>  
Israhel.

<sup>1</sup> The clause of purpose, to *þæm þæt ic sceolde gefyllan mine þa halgan prowunge*, corresponds to nothing in our Latin text of Transitus B and may be a passage of transitional matter added to justify the change in meaning observable in the process of translation; see preceding note.

<sup>2</sup> The statement *7 þa ic was gehwyrfed on mine lichoman* has nothing in Tischendorf's text of Transitus B to suggest it; some such clause may, however, have existed in the Latin source, expressing the idea, "while I was still with you in the body." Such a clause does appear in the Old English version of Transitus B in MS. CCCC 41; see p. 11, note 4.

<sup>3</sup> *Pollicitus sum* has been translated as though it read *sicut pollicitus sum*.

<sup>4</sup> *Dicens quod vos* does not appear in Blickling. The reading *on eallum þæm þe* suggests that whatever stood in the source before *qui secuti* has been rendered as though it were *omnibus*, to modify *vobis*.

<sup>5</sup> *In regeneratione* has given on *þissum menniscum cynne*; *regeneratione* has been taken as *generations*, or even as *genere*, which would account for the *menniscum cynne* of Blickling.

<sup>6</sup> The *cum*-temporal clause of the Latin has been lost on the translator, who rendered *cum sederit* as though it were *sedebam*. *Filius hominis*, instead of being the subject and synonymous with the speaker, as it is in the Latin, is taken as the object of the verb "to sit." *Sedebitis et vos* is taken as though it were *et sedebam super vos*. The translator could not have recognized the ultimate source of this in Matt. xix. 28, and he certainly had not the faintest notion of what Christ was talking about. Our Lord was trying to make the Apostles realize what power He had given them, that they might with boldness ask for the corporal Assumption of the Virgin. For this reason He reminded them of His promise, made before His death, that they should reign with Him and give judgment over the twelve tribes of Israel. Our Lady, as a child of Israel, would come, therefore, under their jurisdiction. They had, thus, but to speak.

<sup>7</sup> *Duodecim* of 53. 2 has been omitted, perhaps because of the complete re-interpretation of the subject matter observable in the Old English. Since the subject of *sedebitis* has been changed from the Apostles, who were to have sat upon the twelve thrones, to Christ, it is absurd to speak of Him as sitting on twelve thrones: therefore the *duodecim* was best dropped and *on minum* added to modify *hehsetle*.

<sup>8</sup> The change of subject evident in rendering *iudicantes* (which properly is in apposition with the Apostles) as *ic demde* (with Christ alone as the subject), is in conformity with the changes in perspective described in the preceding notes.

<sup>9</sup> *prim Israhela folcum* looks like a double translation of *tribus*, once as "three" and again as "tribes." It is probably to be explained as the confusion of *tribus*, as the ablative plural of *tres*, "three," with *tribus*, in the accusative plural, meaning "tribes."

## Blickling

4 7 of þæm twelf mægþum, 7  
 be mines Fæder hæse,<sup>2</sup> ic wearþ  
 eft on lichoman geseted.  
 5<sup>3</sup> 7 for heora halignesse ic me  
 gehalgode to þæm unbesmitenan  
 temple;  
 6 7 heo is seo clæneste fæmne,  
 7 heo wæs fæmne ær hire beorþre,  
 7 heo wunaþ fæmne æfter hire  
 beorþre."

## Transitus B

4 Hanc ergo<sup>1</sup> ex tribubus  
 Israel elegi iussione<sup>2</sup> patris  
 mei, ut inhabitarem in eam."

Transitus E<sup>4</sup>

53. 1 Et dixit apostolis dominus,<sup>4</sup>  
 "Quid gratie et honoris uobis  
 uidetur ut me nunc conferam  
 genetrici?"

Transitus B<sup>4</sup>

53. 1 Ond þa cwæþ Hælend to  
 þæm apostolum,<sup>4</sup> "Hwæt wille  
 ge nu hwæt<sup>5</sup> ic hire doo?"<sup>4</sup>  
 2 7 þa andswarode him Petrus  
 and ealle þa apostolas, 7 cwædon,  
 "Drihten,<sup>6</sup> þu þe gecure þæt fæt

53. 1 "Quid ergo vultis ut faciam  
 ei?"

2 Tunc Petrus et alii apostoli  
 dixerunt, "Domine,<sup>6</sup> tu prae-  
 elegisti hanc ancillam tuam fieri

<sup>1</sup> *Hanc ergo* seems to have got lost, probably in the confusion observable as to this whole passage.

<sup>2</sup> *Iussione patris* is represented by *be mines Fæder hæse*. The rest appears to be an interpretative substitution for an unintelligible reading in the source. The source here must have had a reading rather different in detail from what we find in *Transitus B*.

<sup>3</sup> 52. 5-6 have no counterpart in *Tischendorf's* text of *Transitus B*, though they do appear in the Old English translation of that *Transitus* in MS. CCCC 41; see p. 11, note 4.

<sup>4</sup> In section 53. 1 the Old English is following a text like *Transitus B*, and not like *Transitus E*. The Latin source of *Blickling* must have read as follows: *Et dixit apostolis dominus, "Quid ergo vultis ut faciam ei?"*

<sup>5</sup> *Morris* prints this as follows: *Hwæt wille ge nu? hwæt ic hire do?* I take *hwæt* to be an instance of the type indicated by *Toller* in the *Supplement* under *hwa*, III, a, ii. In MS. CCCC 41 exactly the same usage occurs as in *Blickling*: see above, p. 11, note 4. I therefore delete the question mark after *nu* in my text of *Blickling*.

<sup>6</sup> For 52. 2-5 the source was undoubtedly briefer here than is *Tischendorf's* *Transitus B*. At any rate, the Old English fails to show the last phrase of 53. 2 and all of 53. 3. In the Old English version of *Transitus B* in MS. CCCC 41, the passage under discussion is as follows. In reply to Christ's question concerning His mother, the Apostles answer:

Drihten, nu is geþuht pinum þietre swa swa ðu, deaþe oferswiðdum, ricasast in wuldre, swa awece þu lichoman þinre modor, 7 mid þe bliþne in hiofen gelæd (p. 286).

This is a very close equivalent to *Tischendorf's* *Transitus B*, 53. 3. Compare *Transitus E* as given above. Our four versions—CCCC 41, *Tischendorf's* *Transitus B*, *Transitus E*, and *Blickling*—must in this passus represent somewhat varying versions of the same narrative of the Assumption.

## Blickling

on to eardienne, 7 heo is þin seo  
clæneste fæmne ær ealre worlde,<sup>1</sup>

4 7 þu miht soþlice 7 ge-  
sewenlice þine mihte gecyþan on  
Marian þinre þeowan.<sup>3</sup>  
5 7 þu oferswipdest deaþ, ond  
þu eart rixiende on þinum  
wuldre, swa þu miht þinre  
modor lichoman eft aweccan  
fram deaþe."

## Transitus B

immaculatum tibi thalamum, et  
nos famulos tuos in ministerium  
tuum.<sup>1</sup>

3 Omnia ante saecula prae-  
scivisti cum patre, cum quo tibi,  
et spiritu sancto, est una deitas  
aequalis et infinita potestas.<sup>2</sup>

4 Si ergo potuisset fieri coram  
gratiae tuae potentis, visum nobis  
fuerat famulis tuis rectum esse,<sup>3</sup>  
5 ut, sicut tu devicta morte  
regnas in gloria, ita resuscitans  
matris corpusculum, tecum de-  
duceres eam laetam in caelum."<sup>4</sup>

## Transitus E

53. 3 "Iustum uidetur, domine,  
seruis tuis, ut, sicut tu devicta  
morte regnas in secula, sic tue  
matris resuscites corpusculum,  
et ad dextris tuis colloques in  
eternum."

Transitus B<sup>5</sup>

54. 1 7 þa raþe wæs Drihten  
blissiende on heofenas, 7 wæs  
cweþende to his apostolum,  
"Wese hit nu be eowrum  
domum."

2 7 þa hraþe beaþ Drihten

54. 1 Tunc salvator ait, "Fiat  
secundum vestram sententiam."

2 Et iussit Michaeli<sup>6</sup> arch-

<sup>1</sup> The source must have differed from Transitus B, as we have it, at this point.

<sup>2</sup> 53. 3 must have been entirely missing in the source.

<sup>3</sup> Only parts of 53. 4 of Tischendorf's Latin are recognizable in Blickling. Here again the source of the Old English may have differed from Tischendorf's Latin, though it is not impossible that the strangeness of Blickling is merely another instance of that unsuccessful struggle with the original which we witness so often in that homily.

<sup>4</sup> *Deduceres eam laetam in caelum* is not present in Blickling, with the result that although the Apostles ask Christ to raise His mother from the dead, they do not ask for her assumption. This clause does appear in MS. CCCC 41, in its translation of Transitus B; see above, p. 11, note 4.

<sup>5</sup> The transitional passage may have been somewhat fuller in the source than it is in Transitus B, as the Old English would suggest, though Our Lord's reply to the Apostles is the same in both.

<sup>6</sup> In its details the source must have differed somewhat from Tischendorf's Transitus B. The Old English translator does not seem to be given to rearranging the sections of his source; he may completely alter their meaning, but he will usually preserve the order of their parts. It is probable, therefore, that the source had a sentence like the second part of 54. 2, relating how an archangel

## Blickling

Gabriele<sup>1</sup> þæm heahengle þæt  
he wylede þone stan fram þære  
byrgenne duru.

## Transitus B

angelo ut animam sanctae Mariae  
deferret. Et ecce Michael<sup>1</sup>  
archangelus revolvit lapidem ab  
ostio monumenti.

## Transitus E

3 Ond þa Michael se heahengel  
geongweardode<sup>2</sup> þære eadigan  
Marian sawle beforan Drihtne.

3 Quo annuente, Michael<sup>1</sup>  
archangelus continuo affuit, et  
Mariae animam coram domino  
praesentavit.<sup>2</sup>

rolled the stone away from the mouth of the grave; this must have been followed by another sentence recording the arrival of Michael with Mary's soul. The readings from MS. CCCC 41 and Transitus E are interesting. Transitus E I give above; MS. CCCC 41 runs thus:

7 þa het Drihten Gabriel þone heahengel þæt he wylede þone stan from  
þære byrgene dura. 7 Gabriel se heahengel brohte saule þære halgan Marian  
beforan Drihtne (MS. CCCC 41, pp. 286-287).

The reading of this other Old English Assumption text supports Blickling at this point. Transitus E, it should be remarked, is without 54. 1-2.

The Archangels who are mentioned as taking part in the resurrection of Mary are designated in the various accounts as follows:

Text	Rolls stone	Psychopomp
Blickling	Gabriel	Michael
Transitus B	Michael	Michael
var. MSS. M and B	Gabriel	Michael
MS. CCCC 41	Gabriel	Gabriel
Transitus E	.....	Michael

In Tischendorf's printed text of Transitus B, Michael has been generalized as archangelic agent in both offices; in MS. CCCC 41 it is Gabriel who is so generalized. Blickling and the two variant MSS. of Transitus B agree in naming Michael as the psychopomp and Gabriel as the angel who rolls the stone away, *Apocalypses Apocryphae*, p. 125, var. MSS. M and B. This, I believe, is the proper attribution of these functions. Transitus E describes only the presentation of the soul, with Michael as psychopomp; it does not mention the rolling away of the stone. In naming Michael it is but doing what is to be expected, for in popular angelology Michael is *par excellence* the psychopomp. It is he to whom Christ entrusts the soul of His mother at her death. On the other hand, if the angel who rolls away the stone is to be another angel, and is to be named, it is fitting that it be Gabriel, for whenever might is needed, that is his function, as Isidore of Seville points out:

Gabriel Hebraice in linguam nostram vertitur fortitudo Dei, ubi enim potentia divina vel fortitudo manifestatur, Gabriel mittitur (*Etymologiarum Liber VII*, ch. V. 10, *Patrologia Latina*, LXXXII).

<sup>1</sup> See note 6, p. 14.

<sup>2</sup> *Geongweardode*, so in both Blickling and its variant MS., CCCC 198. Morris prints *geong weardode* and translates: "Michael went and took charge of the soul of the blessed Mary." Holthausen commented on the passage, "Nach *geong* fehlt ein *ð*"; he would emend to read *geong 7 weardode* (F. Holthausen, "Beiträge zur Erklärung und Textkritik Alt- und Mittelenglischer Denkmäler," in *Englische Studien*, xiv, 1890, p. 394). In MS. 198 *geongweardode* is glossed twice, once interlineally and once marginally, each time as *presentavit*. Now the reading of Transitus E is *animam praesentavit*, which probably was also the reading of the source. This would naturally be translated as *geondweardode*. In copying.

## Blickling

55. 1 Ond þa wæs Drihten cwe-  
pende to Marian lichoman, "Aris  
þu, min seo nehste, 7 min culfre,  
7 mines wuldres eardung, 7  
forþon þe þu eart lifes fæt, 7 þu  
eart þæt heofenlice templ,"<sup>2</sup>

2 7 næron nænige leahtras  
gefylde on þinre heortan, ond þu  
ne þrowast nænige þrowunge on  
pinum lichoman."<sup>2</sup>

3 Ond þa cwæp Drihten eft  
to þæm lichoman, "Aris þu nu  
eft of þinre byrgenne."<sup>3</sup>

## Transitus E

55. 1 Tunc salvator loquutus est,  
dicens, "Surge, proxima mea,  
columba mea, tabernaculum  
gloriae meae,<sup>1</sup> vasculum vitae,  
templum coeleste,"<sup>2</sup>

2 ut, sicut per coitum labem  
non sensisti criminis, sic in  
sepulchro solutionem corporis  
minime patiaris."<sup>2</sup>

## Transitus B

55. 1 Et ait dominus, "Exsurge,  
amica mea, et proxima mea,  
2 quae non sumpsisti corrup-  
tionem per coitum, non patiaris  
resolutionem corporis in sepul-  
chro "<sup>3</sup>

however, some scribe has made an unconscious sound substitution of *geong-* for *geond-*, which would be easy enough for an inattentive person. That this substitution occurred at least by the time of the common ancestor of Blickling and CCCC 198 is clear from the fact that both show it. It cannot, therefore, be attributed to the scribe of either manuscript; one of the two scribes might have made this sound substitution, but hardly both. Morris's translation, then, should read: "Michael presented the soul," etc. The reading *geongweardode* (= *geond-weardode*) shows that the source must have agreed with Transitus E on this reading, for Transitus B has *deferret*, which does not suggest *geondweardode* so well as does the *praesentavit* of E. Toller perceived the error in Morris's reading of *geong weardode*, for in the *Supplement*, s.v. *ge-andweardian*, he cites this passage from Blickling, emending to read *geondweardode*, and at the same time observes, in a parenthetical note, that the word was "printed *geong weardode*." He thus implies that Morris's reading was either a printer's error or an inaccuracy on Morris's part in preparing his edition of the *Blickling Homilies*. But the evidence of MS. CCCC 198 corroborates Morris's reading and makes it clear that we are not dealing with a lapse on the part of the printer or of an editor, but with one originating in Old English times and antedating both our extant manuscripts.

The substitution of *geong* for *geond* (= *ge-ond-*) makes it clear, furthermore, that, for the scribe making it, the conjunction "and" was pronounced with an *o*-sound and not with *a*, for there would never have been any confusion between *geong* and *geand*.

<sup>1</sup> With *glorie mee*, MS. L 58, Milan, breaks off. I continue with the text in Th. Graesse, *Jacobi à Voragine Legenda Aurea*, Dresden and Leipzig, 1846, p. 509.

<sup>2</sup> The original of Blickling 55. 1-2 is better represented by Transitus E than by Transitus B. For 55. 1, the correspondencies between the Latin and the Old English are very close; for 55. 2, Blickling seems in some way to be related to the Latin, though in detail the source may have had a different reading from our Transitus E or Transitus B. It may be that the Old English here represents another of its characteristic struggles with its original, though it is quite as possible that the vernacular represents a paraphrastic substitute for the Latin and is a translation according to general sense rather than word for word.

<sup>3</sup> In neither Transitus B nor Transitus E is there a second command on the part of Christ to His mother to arise. The unique reading of Blickling suggests



## Blickling

Transitus B<sup>1</sup>

56. 1 7 þa sona aras Maria of  
 þære byrgenne, 7 ymbfeng<sup>3</sup>  
 Drihtnes fet, ond þa ongan  
 wuldrian on God, 7 wæs cwe-  
 þende,  
 2 "Min Drihten, ne mæg ic  
 ealle þa gife<sup>6</sup> forþbringan þe þu  
 me forgeafe<sup>6</sup> for þinum naman,  
 7 hwæpre hi me magon ealle þine  
 bletsunge gefyllan.<sup>6</sup>  
 3 7 þu eart Israhela God, 7 þu  
 eart ahafen mid þinum Fæder,  
 7 mid þinum þu Halgan Gaste on  
 worlda world."<sup>7</sup>

56. 1 Et statim resurrexit Maria  
 de tumulo, et benedicabat do-  
 minum,<sup>2</sup> et provoluta<sup>3</sup> ad pedes  
 domini adorabat eum, dicens,  
 2 "Non ego tibi condignas<sup>4</sup>  
 gratias possum reddere,<sup>5</sup> domine,  
 pro immensis beneficiis tuis,  
 quae mihi ancillae tuae conferre  
 dignatus es.<sup>6</sup>  
 3 Sit nomen tuum, redemptor  
 mundi, deus Israhel, benedictum  
 in saecula."<sup>7</sup>

that in 55. 3 we have a duplication of 55. 1. It is to be observed that with 55. 2, Blickling appears to take final leave of Transitus E, and for the remainder of the narrative follows Transitus B very closely. This suggests that for the resurrection story the compiler had been working from two different redactions, and that, having utilized Transitus E for Christ's address to His mother, he turned to Transitus B for the sequel. For some reason he chose to repeat the *Exsurge*, perhaps to heighten his account by this second command to arise. For the sake of completeness, I give the conclusion of Transitus E so that the variation between it and Transitus B may readily be seen.

<sup>1</sup> Blickling continues with Transitus B, and such differences as are observable between Tischendorf's text and the Old English are to be explained partly as representing variant readings of the Latin source and partly as the result of that awkwardness in translation so often observed in the Old English.

<sup>2</sup> *Et benedicabat dominum* of Transitus B was probably missing in the source, since it does not appear in Blickling.

<sup>3</sup> *Ymbfeng Drihtnes fet* is in translation of the *provoluta ad pedes* of the Latin. The translator has taken *provoluta* as *pervoluta*. The abbreviations for *pro* and *per* were enough alike so that confusion of the two is common in medieval Latin texts. Cf. Wallace Martin Lindsay, *Contractions in Early Latin Minuscule MSS.*, St. Andrews University Publications, v, Oxford, 1908, pp. 18, 39, 40.

<sup>4</sup> *Condignas* is not represented in the Old English and may well have been missing in the source.

<sup>5</sup> *Gratias reddere* was here too much for the translator, as it was earlier in a similar construction. The Latin of Transitus C, 25. 3, runs thus: *Non enim ego possum tantæ gratiarum actione nomini tuo referre quanta in me conferre dignatus es*. For this there stands in the Old English the following: *Onð þa andswarode him seo halige Maria, 7 wæs cweþende, " Ic do a þine gife, min Drihten, 7 ic þe bidde for þine naman þæt þu gehwyrfe on me ealle eapmodnesse þinra beboda, forþon þe ic mæg don þine gife."* "þu eart gemedomod on ecnesse," Blickling, p. 147, 8-12. In both the idiom "to return thanks" has caused trouble. In 56. 2 *gratias reddere* has been taken literally as "to return, bring forth, produce the gifts," þa gife forþbringan.

<sup>6</sup> I cannot suggest what has gone wrong in the process of translating 56. 2. Possibly the Latin at this point differed considerably from the reading of Tischendorf's printed text.

<sup>7</sup> *Deus Israhel* and *saecula* are about the only words of Tischendorf's Latin text that we can account for in the Old English of 56. 3. Perhaps the *sit nomen tuum* of the Latin has in some way been rendered in 56. 2 as *for þinum naman*.

## Blickling

- 4 Ond þa ahof Drihten hie up,<sup>1</sup>  
 7 hie þa cyste, 7 hie<sup>2</sup> þa sealde  
 Michahele þam heahengle, 7 he  
 hie þa ahof up on wolcnum  
 beforan Drihtnes gesihþe.
57. 1 Ond cwæþ Drihten to þam  
 apostolum, "Gangap nu to me  
 on wolcnum."  
 2 7 þa mid þy þe hie wæron  
 gangende to him, þa wæs Drihten  
 hie cyssende, 7 wæs cwepende,  
 "Pacem meam do uobis, Alle-  
 luia!"<sup>3</sup> Ic forlæte mine sibbe to  
 eow þurh mines Fæder þone  
 Halgan Gast. Ond ic eow sylle  
 mine sibbe þurh min pæt hehste  
 lof; ond ic beo mid eow ealle  
 dagas oþ þa geendunga þisse  
 worlde."<sup>4</sup>  
 3 7 Drihten cwæþ to þam  
 englum,<sup>4</sup> "Singap nu, 7 onfoþ  
 minre meder on neorxna-  
 wonge."<sup>4</sup>  
 4 7 þa apostolas on heora  
 mægene hofan Marian lichoman  
 up mid wolcnum, 7 hine þa  
 asetton on neorxna-wanges ge-  
 fean.<sup>4</sup>

Transitus B<sup>1</sup>

- 4 Et osculans eam dominus  
 recessit,<sup>1</sup> et tradidit animam<sup>2</sup>  
 eius angelis ut deferrent eam in  
 paradisum.
57. 1 Et ait apostolis, "Accedite  
 ad me."  
 2 Et cum accessissent, osculatus  
 est eos et ait,  
 "Pax vobis,"<sup>3</sup>
- quomodo ego semper fui vobis-  
 cum, ita ero usque ad consum-  
 mationem saeculi."<sup>3</sup>  
 3 Et statim cum haec dixisset  
 dominus, elevatus in nube re-  
 ceptus est in caelum,<sup>4</sup>  
 4 et angeli cum eo, deferentes  
 beatam Mariam in paradisum  
 dei.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Recessit* of the Latin seems to have come out as *ahof*, "raised up." The translator must have been puzzled by his source. It is probable that he failed to see how *recessit*, "he departed, withdrew," had any sense in this passage: "Then, kissing her, the Lord departed." The Virgin was at Christ's feet; before He could kiss her, she must have arisen. What more natural than to look for something to suggest this? Because of the similarity of insular *s* and *p*, *recessit*, and particularly if it happened to have been written *recesit*, may have suggested *recepit* to him instead of *recessit*. This would make better sense. In some such way as this, perhaps, did the Old English *ahof* come to stand in translation for *recessit* of the Latin original.

<sup>2</sup> *Animam eius* cannot be correct. We should expect *eam* with reference to Mary herself and we actually find it in two of Tischendorf's manuscripts: MSS. M and B. It is not Mary's soul but her body that is now taken up to heaven. Her soul had just been brought back to be reunited to the body. It is certainly Mary's body, housing her soul, that the angels are commanded to bear to Paradise; see above, pp. 9-10, chapters 48 and 50. 1-2.

<sup>3</sup> Here the source must have differed from Tischendorf's text of *Transitus B*, as the Latin tag preserved in Blickling makes evident. The Old English seems in its translation to present a blending of two passages, John xiv. 27 and Matt. xxviii. 20.

<sup>4</sup> The Old English departs so much from the Latin as to suggest that in 57. 3 the source must have differed markedly from *Transitus B*. On the other hand, just such differences between Blickling and the Latin can in other instances be

## Blickling

5 7 nu syndon gesette þa  
apostolas in hlet-æ hie bodian  
hire.<sup>1</sup>

## Transitus B

5 Apostolis autem susceptis in  
nubibus reversi sunt unusquisque  
in sortem praedicationis suae.

shown to be the result of struggle with a difficult original by one of weak latinity. The strange confusion as to inflexional endings evidenced by rendering *elevatus*, a perfect indicative, "he was taken up," as though it were a present imperative, *onfoþ*, "take up," is very frequently seen in this Blickling Homily. The translator's struggles with his source in 57. 3 have not led to happy results. After the angels have been commanded to sing and take up Mary's body, we do not expect to be told in the very next sentence that it was the Apostles who "with all their might raised the body of Mary up in the clouds and placed it in the bliss of Paradise," as Morris renders it, *Blickling Homilies*, p. 156. Actually, it is the angels who performed this function. As for the Apostles, they are themselves taken up in clouds, as in the next verse, that they may be returned miraculously to the very places whence they had been rapt away six days earlier, to be present at Mary's death.

<sup>1</sup> The Old English must be jumbled at this point. The Latin makes clear that the Apostles were now set down each at his own station, according as it fell to him by lot and where it was God's will for him to preach the Gospel. In *sortem praedicationis suae* is recognizable in the *in hlet-æ hie bodian hire* of Blickling, even though the Old English, as it stands in Morris, does not make sense. Morris translates this as "by lot ever to proclaim her abroad," while Toller, in the *Supplement*, s.v. *hlit*, translates 57. 5 thus: "now are the Apostles appointed to the task (?) of ever proclaiming her" (the question mark is Toller's). This, while it makes a sort of sense, does not convey the meaning of the Latin. Something, I believe, has happened to the Old English. In *sortem praedicationis suae* should have given in *hlet hira* (or *heora*) *bodunge*, or in *hlet þær hie bodien* (or *bodian sceoldon*). *Hlet æ* of Blickling has caused trouble. Morris and Toller took *æ* as a variant of *d*, "ever," which phonologically is extremely unlikely. It may be a mutilated form of *æt* [*æt hire bodunge*] with the *t* lost by some scribal error. If so, this hypothecated accident must have occurred by the time of the archetype of our two Old English manuscripts, since both Blickling and MS. CCC 198 show the same reading. It is equally possible, however, that *æ* may be the word "law," as the second element of a hitherto unrecorded compound, *hlet-æ*, with the meaning "divine law or disposition revealed through the casting of lots." Surely it could not have been mere chance that governed the dispersal of the Apostles to their missionary stations, for the Divine Will must certainly have guided the fall of the lot, and thereby have made known His Providence. An analogous *æ*-compound can be found in *tungol-æ*, literally "star-law," but more precisely the working out of Divine Providence through the influence of the stars, or the revelation of the Divine Will through the stars. Cf. Heinrich Henel, "Planetenglauben in Ælfrics Zeit," in *Anglia*, XLVI, 1934, pp. 292-317. To a medieval churchman, *æ* meant not only human but, even more, divine law: cf. *Cristes æ*, "Gospel," and *æ* in the sense of "scriptures, revelation." The religious character of Anglo-Saxon law is apparent on every page of their legal compilations. *Hie bodian hire*, of Blickling, cannot be correct, but must represent some mangled version of *praedicationis suae*. *Hire* should not be a genitive or dative singular, with reference to the Virgin, but must originally have been a genitive plural, *hira*, or *heora*, etc., which in the form *hira* could easily be confused with *hire*, particularly by the time of Blickling and later, and so could become mistaken for the singular, *hire*. Thus, a reading which originally referred to the Apostles, as it should, has by some accident of transmission come to refer, though erroneously, to Mary instead. In case of any ambiguity, this would be but natural, since the whole homily is about her. In all probability *praedicationis suae* was originally translated *heora*, or *hira*, *bodunge*. But, as has happened to many another passage in this text, the translation, once clear and correct, has since become obscured, either through accident or revision, or both.

## A CENSUS OF BAD QUARTOS

BY LEO KIRSCHBAUM

IN a famous passage from "To the great Variety of Readers" which prefaces the First Folio of Shakespeare (1623), Heminge and Condell wrote :

where (before) you were abus'd with diuerse stolne, and surreptitious copies, maimed, and deformed by the frauds and stealthes of injurious imposters, that expos'd them : euen those, are now offer'd to your view cur'd and perfect of their limbes . . .

The "maimed and deformed" versions to which this passage refers were certain corrupt texts of Shakespeare's plays published in quarto form. Plays by other dramatists also appeared in "maimed and deformed" versions during the reigns of Elizabeth and James. Such corrupt texts have been dubbed "bad quartos."

The simplest way to describe a bad quarto is to state that it cannot possibly represent a written transcript of the author's text. All hypotheses concerning these corrupt versions imply, to a greater or less degree, a stage of memorial transmission.<sup>1</sup> When one compares the text of a bad quarto with the text as the author wrote it (if the good text exists), the following kinds of corruption are evident : substitution of words and phrases ; omission of words, phrases, and lines ; addition of words, phrases, and lines ; transposition of words, phrases, and lines ; corruption of blank verse due to one or more of the above causes ; mislining of blank verse ; so-called "mishearings."<sup>2</sup> Frequently one will find sheer nonsense taking the place of clarity and sense. General vulgarization

<sup>1</sup> Theories as to the origin of the bad quartos include piracy by means of a shorthand report of performance ; piracy by means of a pirate actor who created the text from his knowledge of performance ; piracy by means of a group of actors who reconstructed the play from memory ; piracy by means of memorization of prompt-book. Those who hold to the shorthand theory for one or more bad texts always consider some of the corruption as due to the actor's inaccurate recitals of the author's text.

<sup>2</sup> "Mishearing" is merely a convenient name for a type of auditory error that occurs between one's seeing or hearing a word or words and one's repeating that word or words. A good example is a Freshman's "taken for granite." See E. K. Chambers, *William Shakespeare : A Study of Facts and Problems* (Oxford University Press, 1930), I. 180.

is always present. Passages occur which are merely mosaics of pieces in the original lines which they represent. Another specific phenomenon which has been pointed out in certain bad quartos is but a stronger kind of transposition, the presence of lines or passages before or after the places where they should rightly be. The bringing in of lines from other plays has also been noted in certain of these texts. I am interested in two other kinds of corruption to which little or no attention has hitherto been paid: speeches given to the wrong characters, and characters "borrowing" lines from other characters. Moreover, I believe that in those texts which scholars accept as memorial reconstructions, a great many omissions can be accounted for by a mnemonic phenomenon which I have termed "telescoping," the memory's skipping from one line to another because of similar phraseology.

Criticism of such texts is, to-day, largely in a state of chaos because *no scholar*, whether he has written of one bad quarto, or of two or more bad quartos, or of all the bad quartos of which he knows, *has ever taken the trouble to ascertain how many bad quartos there really are*. Consequently, I determined to examine as many Elizabethan and Jacobean published play-texts as I could get my hands on. My search has been well rewarded, for I have ascertained that there are more than twice as many bad quartos as scholars generally recognize! There may easily be *more* than I have found.

In the following pages I give the results of my search—a list of twenty "maimed and deformed" texts. A full analysis of each text is not given, but the minimum of evidence to prove that the included text is, indeed, a bad quarto. When I am not the first to indicate that a certain text is a bad quarto, it seems sufficient to rely on the testimony of other scholars. In each case, however, the inclusion of a given text has been based on a complete and careful examination. Satisfactorily thorough analyses for "new" bad quartos will have to wait for further occasion. I may add that in some cases I had determined that the quarto was bad before I came across published statements advancing the same view.

#### I. SHAKESPEARE'S *ROMEO AND JULIET*

The bad quarto of *Romeo and Juliet* appeared in 1597. In 1599 a quarto representing the text as Shakespeare wrote it appeared. I quote Chambers on the relation between Q1 and Q2:

Q1 is certainly a "reported" text, and its derivation from an original more closely resembling Q2 is apparent. Lines necessary to explain the sense of what is left are omitted (i. I. 115-22; i. 2. 1-3, iii. 2. 45-51; 102-6). Points are lost through alterations of order (i. I. 19-37; 51-8; i. 2. 38-45). Passages are represented by mere paraphrases, or by scattered lines, with or without connective padding. The reporter tends to break down in bustling scenes, with much action and confused speech. The fight in i. I. 69-87 is only indicated by a stage-direction, and the stage-directions generally vary from Q2 and often read like descriptions of action seen on the stage. Except a short dialogue of servants in i. 5. 1-17, no episode of Q2 is entirely omitted. There are many small mislineations, and a good deal of irregular metre. Even well-reported passages contain alternatives of syntax or vocabulary to the language in corresponding lines of Q2. Actor's ejaculations are occasionally introduced. There is a gag (ii. 4. 21). Most evidential of a reporter are transpositions of lines and phrases from one place to another (i. I. 120 to iii. I. 172; ii. 4. 25 to iii. I. 104; ii. 6. 21 to ii. 3. 31; iii. 2. 88 to ii. 5. 26; iii. 4. 6-7, 33 to i. 5. 126; v. 1. 64-5 to ii. 5. 5; v. 2. 6-8 to v. 3. 251). The reporter, however, is more competent than some others, and succeeds in working his fragments into a fairly continuous text. The best-done scenes are perhaps i. 1. 88-end; i. 2; i. 3. 1-48; i. 4; i. 5. 18-146; ii. 1-4; iii. 3; iii. 5. 1-59; iv. 1. On the whole the work deteriorates from ii. 6 onwards, and towards the end the divergence from Q2 is considerable.<sup>1</sup>

## II. SHAKESPEARE'S *THE MERRY WIVES OF WINDSOR*

The bad quarto of *Merry Wives* appeared in 1602. Shakespeare's true text was first published in the Folio of 1623. Chambers provides a convenient summary of the material in W. W. Greg's edition of Q1:<sup>2</sup>

The relation between Q and F has been minutely examined in the admirable study by Greg. . . .

Q is obviously a "garbled and corrupt" text. The most obvious thing about it is the presence of a reporter. "The playhouse thief reveals himself in every scene," bringing about "gross corruption, constant mutilation, meaningless inversion and clumsy transposition." Scenes iv. 1 and v. 1-4 of F are omitted altogether, and there are considerable omissions in other scenes, some of which cause sense-lacunæ. Scenes iii. 4 and iii. 5 appear in inverted order. Particularly significant of a reporter are numerous "anticipations and recollections" . . . of passages from earlier and later scenes. Moreover, there are similar transferences from other plays (sc. v. 352 from *1 Hen. IV*, ii. 4. 366; sc. v. 363 from *2 Hen. IV*, v. 3. 124; sc. xiii. 1188 from *Ham.* v. 1. 312

<sup>1</sup> William Shakespeare, I. 341-2.

<sup>2</sup> Shakespeare's *Merry Wives of Windsor* 1602, Tudor and Stuart Library, Oxford University Press, 1910.



in its Q2 and F form). The report degenerates from iii. 3 onwards and in iii. 4; iv. 4 and v. 5 are passages of un-Shakespearean verse.<sup>1</sup>

### III. SHAKESPEARE'S *HENRY V*

The bad text of *Henry V* was first published in 1600. The text as Shakespeare composed it first appeared in the Folio (1623). I quote Chambers' analysis of the bad quarto :

If Q1 is read side by side with F1, it is impossible to regard it as anything but a continual perversion of the same text. Some of the verse-lines are truly rendered; others contain words related to those of F1 as variants of inflexion or indifferent alternatives, or words which read like mishearings. Many phrases are omitted, resulting in mislineations. Line after line is bungled metrically, by a writer incapable of handling blank verse. Larger omissions cause *lacunæ* in the sense. Sometimes Q gives a mere paraphrase of the substance of F. The prose scenes are even more fragmentary, and are throughout in lines of irregular length and capitalized as verse. As a paradoxical result, Pistol's speeches resume verse form. There are some transpositions in the order of the dialogue, especially in the prose scenes. Two scenes (iv. 4, 5) change places. One passage, at the end of iii. 7, appears in F at iv. 2. 62-3. There is at least one phrase, at the end of ii. 3, of indecent "gag." This corruption is far beyond what can be attributed to errors of transcription and printing, and can only be explained by some process of reporting. It in certain respects differs from that to be observed in *Henry VI*, *Romeo and Juliet*, and *Hamlet*. There is no introduction of un-Shakespearean verse; practically everything is related to F. . . . The best-rendered scenes are those in which Exeter, Gower, and the Governor of Harfleur appear. . . . And the historical corrections attributed to Q by Daniel are also illusory. It is true that, while F is in general closer to Holinshed than Q, its introduction of the Dauphin at Agincourt is a departure, inconsistent with the King's order (iii. 5. 63) for him to stay at Rouen, whereas Q leaves him out at Agincourt and gives his speeches there to Bourbon. But the inconsistency is nothing to Shakespeare; the Dauphin must come into dramatic conflict with Henry; and I can only suppose that the reporter has failed to disentangle the French lords. He also brings in among them (iii. 7; iv. 5), apparently for the Rambures of F, a Gebon, possibly an actor's name.<sup>2</sup>

On the shortness of Q's text, Professor H. T. Price has written :

The Folio in the reprint by the Shakespeare Society of New York runs to 3,376 lines, the Quarto only to 1,721. And even this number is less than it appears. The Quarto has a trick of splitting up its prose into very short lines in order to give it the appearance of poetry. This,

<sup>1</sup> *William Shakespeare*, I. 429-30.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, I. 391-2.

of course, increases the number of lines. Estimated purely by the number of words, the advantage of the Folio would be much greater.

The Quarto lacks all the Choruses and the Epilogue, and the whole of 1, i., 3, i. 4, ii. (except for the last speech, which is tagged on to 3, vii.). Long speeches, whether in prose or verse, are very much longer in the Folio than in the Quarto, and often when they occur in the Quarto, they are scarcely intelligible, owing to the connecting parts having dropped out. See especially 1, ii., 33-95. A more important difference affects little groups of speeches, usually occurring at the beginning or at the end of a scene, which are not necessary to the action and yet form a sort of comment on it, helping to explain it more fully. Such groups are very often wanting in Quarto. Cf. 1, ii., 115-135; 2, ii., 155-165; 3, ii., 79-153.<sup>1</sup>

#### IV. SHAKESPEARE'S *HAMLET*

A bad quarto of *Hamlet* was published in 1603. A good quarto of the play was published in the following year. Another text, exactly the same as Q2 except for minutiae and certain omissions, is to be found in the First Folio. Chambers writes :

It is generally accepted that many of its [Q1's] features are due to a reporter, introducing, as in 2, 3 *Henry VI*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *Henry V*, and *Merry Wives of Windsor*, "gross corruption, constant mutilation, meaningless inversion and clumsy transposition." . . . A comparison with Q2 and F, wherever the substance is the same, is a continuous revelation of the reporter. He makes omissions, causing *lacunae* of sense and grammar. He gives the beginnings and ends of speeches without their middles. He paraphrases. He merges distinct speeches. He makes a mosaic of recollected fragments. He catches vigorous words without their context. He makes double use of phrases. He shifts the order of bits of dialogue within their scenes. Above all he uses or echoes in one scene passages which really belong to an earlier or later one. Thus vii. 53 of Q1 is from iii. 2. 354, ix. 211-21 from iv. 2. 12-23, xi. 34-5 from i. 5. 49-50, xi. 46 from iii. 3. 90, xv. 8 from iv. 5. 137; while i. 1. 173 is echoed in ii. 25 of Q1, iii. 2. 138 in ii. 33, i. 2. 193 in iii. 12, iii. 1. 160 in v. 38, i. 5. 185-7 in viii. 18. The process entails much vulgarization. Many lines are unmetrical or bald. Many words are represented by weak synonyms; others by words of similar sound but different sense or no sense, which point to errors of hearing. By hearing, too, many "connective" words introduced by actors have been incorporated. These, with omissions and failures to recognize Shakespeare's short lines, have led to much mislineation. Nearly all the prose is printed in capitalized lines of irregular length. A few exceptions may be due to the occasional realization of the compositor that he is dealing with prose. I do not think that the reporter was wholly ignorant of

<sup>1</sup> *The Text of Henry V* (Newcastle-under-Lyme, 1920), pp. 1-2.

blank verse, in spite of his metrical lapses. He fakes up a good many lines, and when he comes on a couplet and has forgotten a rhyming word, he is often capable of substituting another. But he evidently fought shy of reconstructing imperfectly recollected long speeches, and left them incoherent. The stage-directions must be his own; they are of a descriptive character, although not so elaborate as some in *Romeo and Juliet*. And in two places (xi. 7, 115) he puts into words what he has merely seen as dumb action on the stage. Some portions of the play are better reported than others: The scenes (i. 1; i. 2. 160-258; i. 4; i. 5. 113-91), in which Marcellus occurs, are notably good, although not perfect . . . The single long speech (ii. 2. 60-80) of Voltimand agrees almost exactly with F.<sup>1</sup>

A full treatment of the "echoes" from other plays in Q1 has been made by Van Dam.<sup>2</sup>

#### V. SHAKESPEARE'S *PERICLES*

We possess only a "maimed and deformed" version of *Pericles*. Pollard calls it "a scandalously bad text," "so bad that it has been likened to that of the pirated *Romeo and Juliet*."<sup>3</sup> Chambers writes: "The text is extremely corrupt and even in the free rearrangement of modern editions many lines remain unrhythmical. Long sections of verse, especially in Acts iii-v, are printed as prose, or are irregularly divided."<sup>4</sup> Unfortunately no study of *Pericles* as, specifically, a bad quarto has appeared (although no modern scholar appears to have questioned the premise that it is such a text). Having completed an exhaustive examination of the extant *Pericles*, I can report that all the various kinds of corruption found in it have their parallel in other bad versions.

#### VI, VII. SHAKESPEARE'S 2 AND 3 *HENRY VI*

The bad quarto of 2 *Henry VI* was published in 1594 as *The First Part of the Contention betwixt the two famous Houses of Yorke and Lancaster*, and the bad quarto of 3 *Henry VI* in 1595 as *The True Tragedie of Richard Duke of Yorke*. The plays appeared as the author wrote them in the First Folio (1623).

I quote Sir Edmund Chambers on the bad quartos:

<sup>1</sup> William Shakespeare, I. 415-6.

<sup>2</sup> *The Text of Shakespeare's Hamlet* (London, 1924), pp. 59-62.

<sup>3</sup> *Shakespeare Folios and Quartos* (London, 1909), pp. 78-9.

<sup>4</sup> William Shakespeare, I. 520-1.

Q and F compare as follows. The main structure, in plot, order of episodes, distribution of characters, even succession of speakers, is, subject to certain *lacunæ* and dislocations, the same. Q is in both parts the shorter by about a third, and omits a good deal of the best poetry in F. The purport of what is left agrees, but the differences of phrasing are very notable; especially in *2 Henry VI*, where Q throughout diverges far more from F than in *3 Henry VI*. Misprints in both texts must of course be allowed for. Sometimes the speeches are identical. Sometimes the identity is only broken by the introduction of equivalent words, variant inflexions, variant minor parts of speech, variations in the order of words. In these passages there is often not much to choose between the two versions from a literary point of view. Sometimes, again, the versions are little more than paraphrases of each other, with an occasional phrase in common, and sometimes complete paraphrases. There are passages in Q which look like mosaics of scraps from F. Prose in Q may represent verse in F. A Q line often appears in an earlier or even later speech or scene or even part of F, and may be repeated there in Q. Thus in *2 Hen. VI*, iii. 49 of Q is from ii. 3. 29; vi. 55 from i. 1. 254; x. 14-15 from iii. 1. 69-71; in *3 Hen. VI*, v. 52-3 from i. 2. 33-4; x. 30-1 from v. 3. 1-2; xii. 107 from v. 7. 22; xxiii. 19-21 from iv. 8. 60-1; also in *2 Hen. VI*, ix. 118 from *3 Hen. VI*, i. 4. 102; xxii. 64 from *3 Hen. VI*, ii. 5. 135. Metrically, Q is inferior to F; it has more harshly irregular lines and many collocations of ten syllables, which pay no regard to stress. The pronunciation of individual words is more archaic in Q than in F. The lineation of Q constantly goes astray, and this often seems due to the omission of F words or to the presence of superfluous "connective" phrases . . . not in F, after which the verse lines follow regularly but are wrongly divided, until a broken line or a fresh error leads to recovery. Broadly speaking, Q is often halting and barbarous, where F is logical and rhythmical.<sup>1</sup>

"Echoes" of Marlowe's *Edward II* and *Tamburlaine* in *The Contention* have been comprehensively treated by Peter Alexander.<sup>2</sup>

#### VIII. SHAKESPEARE'S *KING LEAR*

The true relationship between Q and F of *King Lear* is just beginning to be understood. Q1 (1608) is a bad quarto, one of the "copies, maimed, and deformed" to which Heminge and Condell refer. I quote Greg:

The main features of the Quarto text appear to be as follows: in outward form, misrepresentation of the metrical structure, and defective

<sup>1</sup> *William Shakespeare*, i. 281-2. I must not be understood as endorsing any theory of provenance to be found in the analyses I have borrowed from other scholars.

<sup>2</sup> *Shakespeare's Henry VI and Richard III* (Cambridge University Press, 1929), pp. 95-97.

and misleading punctuation; textually, constant redundancy of expression, and persistent substitution of another (and generally inferior) reading for that of the Folio.

The printing of the verse is chaotic: sometimes prose is divided as verse, more often verse is run on like prose; and when verse is recognized as such, the lines are wrongly divided with a frequency that is altogether exceptional. Of course, revision and marginal addition in a manuscript may easily lead a printer to divide the lines wrongly, but this will not account for a whole long verse-scene appearing as prose; while to suggest that Shakespeare may, for some inscrutable reason, have written it as prose, seems to me really to beg the question. Little stress can be laid on the punctuation, for some autograph manuscripts, such as the Shakespearian addition to *Sir Thomas More*, are notoriously deficient in this respect. But the general impression left by the Quarto is that the printer had before him copy that was entirely undivided metrically and altogether without punctuation. There is, indeed, some slight bibliographical evidence to this effect. Such copy would normally result from a shorthand report, and I do not know what else would produce it.

To pass to textual features: by redundancy I understand the expansion and dilution of the text, on the one hand by the introduction of exclamations, expletives, vocatives, and connective words generally, on the other hand by the use of looser and less close-knit phrasing. Such redundancy is characteristic of actors and is a marked feature of reported texts. . . .

Moreover, these connectives tend to be borrowed or repeated from other passages, such assimilation being another common trick of actors.

. . . The reporter reveals his presence by a number of mistakes of hearing. . . . Further traces of the reporter are a number of speeches assigned to the wrong character, and sometimes modified to suit. . . .

But it is the verbal variants of the two texts that supply the most ample evidence of reporting. Such changes must inevitably occur on the stage, and the substituted word will be either indifferent or generally inferior.<sup>1</sup>

#### IX. SHAKESPEARE'S *RICHARD III*

Having determined, about two years ago, to my own satisfaction that Q1 of *Richard III* (1597) was a memorial reconstruction of the true text that first appeared in the Folio, I am to-day happy to point out that I no longer need consider my conclusion as unique. To begin with, a recent sentence by Greg indicated that he now includes Q in the same category as Q of *Lear*.<sup>2</sup> In 1936 David

<sup>1</sup> "The Function of Bibliography in Literary Criticism illustrated in a Study of the Text of *King Lear*," *Neophilologus*, XVIII (1932-3), 253-4.

<sup>2</sup> "*King Lear*—Mislineation and Stenography," *Library*, Fourth Series, XVII (1936), 175.

Lyall Patrick's *The Textual History of "Richard III"* was published;<sup>1</sup> this had been submitted as a doctoral dissertation in 1934. Patrick finds evidence of corruption due to mnemonic failure throughout Q. Although I cannot subscribe to his conclusion that Q is a report of Shakespeare's play as the actors spoke it, he has certainly proved to the hilt that Q's text contains irresistible evidence of having been memorially transmitted.<sup>2</sup>

I quote the convenient summary of his views given in an abstract of his doctor's thesis :

The present investigation began . . . with a complete catalogue of the textual variants between Q and F and has held itself responsible for the inclusion of every item in the theory presented.

First are considered those textual variants which indicate that the quarto is a stage abridgment. In this classification it was found possible to include much material usually given other explanations. When it is seen that the quarto text is certainly an acting version of the play, the circumstances surrounding the publication of the quarto are considered with the purpose of determining what theories may be maintained concerning its origin. The question is raised whether the quarto may not be an actors' text, as well as an acting text. Further classifications of the variants are then offered to show that the text has been memorially transmitted. These classifications correspond to the kinds of changes in memorized lines which an actor naturally makes in uttering his lines on the stage.

Considerable numbers of the quarto variations are found to be the errors which result when the actor attempts to recite passages which associate themselves in his memory with similar passages in other parts of the play. This "memorial shifting" includes both anticipations and recollections, and transpositions. Other tricks of the memory and natural slips in recitation are classified as "memorial substitutions," and these include the replacing of words with their synonyms, changes in the number of nouns, variations in the terms of address and reference, use of different exclamations and interjections, simplifications and colloquialisms, and emendations, intentional or unintentional. Further classifications of memory errors are omissions of words and phrases not obviously necessary to the sense of the passage, the omission of a complete line or several lines, and the omissions of longer passages. (In the last instance other reasons for omission are frequent.) Throughout these sections of the dissertation the possibility of other explanations of the instances used is kept in mind and where there is need is discussed.

<sup>1</sup> Stanford University Publications, Language and Literature, vol. vi, No. 1, Stanford University Press, 1936.

<sup>2</sup> See especially Chapter V ("Errors of Memory—Shifting") and Chapter VI ("Errors of Memory—Substitution"), pp. 35-104.



Finally, the case for the memorial transmission of the quarto text is offered as proved by reason of the quantity and completeness of the evidence, and the successful exclusion of other hypotheses.<sup>1</sup>

X. THE "PARLIAMENT SCEANE" IN Q4 OF SHAKESPEARE'S  
*RICHARD II*

Lines iv. i. 154-318 are not present in Q1 (1597) of *Richard II*. They first appear in Q4 (1608), the cancel title-page of which reads: "With new additions of the Parliament Sceane, and the deposing of King Richard." Comparison of these lines as they are given in Q4 with F reveals omission and mislineation. Pollard and Chambers suggest, I think correctly, that the passage as it appears in Q4 was reported.<sup>2</sup>

XI. GREENE'S *ORLANDO FURIOSO*

*Orlando Furioso* (Q1, 1594) is, perhaps, to-day the most well-known of the non-Shakespearian bad quartos. The authentic text has not survived, but we do possess Alleyn's *part* for Orlando. Comparison of it with the corresponding lines of Q make the latter's badness apparent. Greg has thoroughly investigated Q in the second half of *Two Elizabethan Stage Abridgements* (Oxford University Press, 1923). He proves beyond doubt that its text is "based almost throughout on reconstruction from memory."<sup>3</sup>

After examining Q's text in relation to Alleyn's part line by line,<sup>4</sup> he considers its "important divergencies" under ten heads:

First there are seven types of variant, namely, (1) indifferent, (2) the insertion of connective phrases, (3) anticipations and recollections, (4) avoidance of the unfamiliar, (5) misunderstandings, (6) changes in disregard of sense, (7) changes in disregard of verse; further there are three more general questions, namely, (8) avoidance or the reverse of verbal repetitions, (9) attempts to emend obscurities in the original, and (10) the treatment of metre in general.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Abstracts of Dissertations, Stanford University, vol. x (1934-5), *Stanford University Bulletin*, Sixth Series, No. 18, pp. 44-5.

<sup>2</sup> *King Richard II, A New Quarto, Reproduced in Facsimile*, ed. A. W. Pollard (London, 1916), p. 64; Chambers, *William Shakespeare*, i. 350.

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 134. I quarrel with Greg's reasons for "almost."

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 140-248.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 314. Discussion under these divisions covers pp. 314-332.

XII. MARLOWE'S *THE MASSACRE AT PARIS*

The undated octavo of *The Massacre at Paris* is without the least shadow of doubt a "maimed and deformed" version of a true text which has not (except for a single scene, *infra*) come down to us. Greg writes of this bad text:

The copy was most likely surreptitiously obtained. . . .

There can be little doubt as to the nature of the text it contains. It has, indeed, been argued that the fullness of some of the stage-directions points to derivation from a playhouse manuscript: but this is hardly so, their descriptive character being rather what one would expect from someone witnessing or remembering a performance. The text is exceedingly short: less than 1600 lines in the present reprint, the equivalent of little over 1250 lines of verse according to Tucker Brooke's reckoning. . . . Nor is it easy to suppose that the text has been reduced to its present state by mere cutting, for it is at times so confused as to be hardly intelligible, while the structure of the verse is frequently lost. Indeed, except in a few speeches it retains little of the character of any piece that Marlowe can be supposed to have written. Even among the admittedly garbled versions it has an evil distinction, and must for shortness and fatuity be classed with such pieces as *The Famous Victories of Henry V* and *Orlando Furioso*.<sup>1</sup>

Line 1220 of the extant *Massacre at Paris* repeats *Julius Cæsar*, II. iii. 28. Line 953 is a verbatim borrowing from 3 *Henry VI*, II. vi. 32, and lines 1,376-7 are an almost verbatim report of II. i. 68-9 from the same play.

As I have already indicated, a single scene of the original text has survived; it corresponds with lines 972-97 of the octavo. Written in an Elizabethan hand, it covers both sides of a small piece of foolscap. Greg remarked, "If the fragment is authentic then the nature of the printed text becomes clear enough. The form in which the verse appears might of course be due to cutting, but the prose can hardly have assumed such a shape except through reconstruction from memory."<sup>2</sup> Recently challenged by Dr. Tannenbaum,<sup>3</sup> the authenticity of the manuscript has been completely vindicated by J. Q. Adams.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Malone Society Reprint, ed. W. W. Greg (1928), pp. viii-x.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. xvi.

<sup>3</sup> *Shakesperian Scraps* (Columbia University Press, 1933), pp. 177-86.

<sup>4</sup> "The *Massacre at Paris* Leaf," *Library*, Fourth Series, xiv (1933-4), pp. 447-469.

XIII. THOMAS HEYWOOD'S *IF YOU KNOW NOT ME, YOU  
KNOW NOBODY, PART I.*

The bad quarto of Thomas Heywood's *If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody, or The Troubles of Queen Elizabeth, Part I* was first published in 1605. No good text exists. Q is the only bad quarto for which we possess the independent testimony of the author that it is a bad quarto. The following prologue from Heywood's *Plesant Dialogues and Drama's* (1637) contains that information :

*A Prologue to the Play of Queene Elizabeth as it was last revived at the Cock-pit, in which the Author taxeth the most corrupted copy now imprinted, which was published without his consent.*

*Prologue.*

Playes have a fate in their conception lent,  
Some so short liv'd, no sooner shew'd, than spent ;  
But borne to day, to morrow buried, and  
Though taught to speake, neither to goe nor stand.  
This : (by what fate I know not) sure no merit,  
That it disclaimes, may for the age inherit.  
Writing 'bove one and twenty ; but ill nurst,  
And yet receiv'd, as well perform'd at first,  
Grac't and frequented, for the cradle age,  
Did throng the Seates, the Boxes, and the Stage  
So much ; that some by Stenography drew  
The plot : put it in print : (scarce one word trew :)  
And in that lamenesse it hath limp't so long,  
The Author now to vindicate that wrong  
Hath tooke the paines, upright upon its feete  
To teach it walke, so please you sit, and see't.<sup>1</sup>

At times the text seems quite good :

*Gage.* My griued Mistresse humbly thus intreats,  
For to remooue backe to the Common stayres,  
And not to land where Traytors put to shore,  
Some difference she intreats your Honors make  
Twixt Christall Fountaines, and fowle muddy Springs,  
Twixt those that are condemned by the law,  
And those whome Treasons staine did neuer blemish :  
Thus she attends your answer, and sits still  
Whilst her wet eyes, full many a teare did spill.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Quoted in *If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody, Part I*, Malone Society Reprint, ed. Madeleine Doran and W. W. Greg (1935), p. xxxviii.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, vv. 559-567.

More often the text is demonstrably bad :

*Benif* : Has not your sister (gratious Queene) a hand  
In these petitions ; well your highnes knowes  
She is a fauorite of these heritiques.

*Winch* : And well remembred, is't not probable,  
That she in *Wiats* expedition,  
And other insurrection lately queald  
Was a confederate ; if your highnes wil your owne estate preserue,  
You must foresee fore-danger, and cut off all such  
As would your safetie preiudice.

*Bening* : Such is your sister,  
A meere opposite to vs in our opinion, and besides  
Shees next Successiue, should your maiesty  
Dye yssules, which heauen defend.<sup>1</sup>

#### XIV. A KNACK TO KNOW AN HONEST MAN

One who examines the extant text of *A Knack to Know an Honest Man* (1596) will immediately recognize that it belongs in the canon of " maimed and deformed " versions. Greg has written of it : " The text of the *Honest Man* is in a terrible state of confusion, and the guess may with tolerable confidence be hazarded that the copy was surreptitiously obtained from actual performance." <sup>2</sup> Chambers echoes this conclusion.<sup>3</sup> One need not guess. There are in Q certain characteristics of bad quartos in general which definitely admit it into the category of such texts. I cannot go into the matter at present. The apparent corruption of the following lines should be evidence enough :

*Sen.* Thou doest demeane too much intemperance,  
Thou foolish man arise, do not stain the badge of age  
And wisdom by misgouernment.  
Our senators in Venice are well schoold in such haps,  
And can doome of things, not by thy teares,  
Or sorrow working wordes,  
But by the truth and estimate of acts,  
Thou sayst that Lelio slew Sempronio,  
But that assertion Seruio must not serue,  
To proue him guiltie in these reuerend eares.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody, Part I*, Malone Society Reprint, ed. Madeleine Doran and W. W. Greg (1935), vv. 95-107.

<sup>2</sup> *A Knack to Know an Honest Man* (1596), Malone Society Reprint, ed. H. De Vocht and W. W. Greg (1910), p. vii.

<sup>3</sup> *The Elizabethan Stage* (Oxford University Press, 1923), IV. 24.

<sup>4</sup> Malone Society Reprint, vv. 159-168.

## XV. THE FAMOUS VICTORIES OF HENRY THE FIFTH

I believe that it was John Dover Wilson who first recognized the extant *Famous Victories* (Q1, 1598) as a bad quarto. In a private communication to Dr. Greg, the substance of which the latter gave in *Two Elizabethan Stage Abridgements* (1923), Wilson suggested that "*The Famous Victories* represents the best the actors could do in the way of memorial reconstruction, aided only by the labours of 'Sykes' comic man [the Queen's Company's clown]."<sup>1</sup> But Dr. Greg did not agree with Wilson: "The extreme baldness of the text of the *Famous Victories* is amply explained by the quite unusually drastic compression which it has manifestly undergone, and it is, I think, uncritical to take it as a standard of what the actors, left to themselves, could produce."<sup>2</sup> A statement written in 1928, however, seems to indicate that Dr. Greg has changed his mind, that he now regards the extant text of the *Famous Victories* as a bad quarto: "Even among admittedly garbled versions it [*The Massacre at Paris*] has an evil distinction, and must for shortness and fatuity be classed with such pieces as *The Famous Victories of Henry V* and *Orlando Furioso*."<sup>3</sup>

In a doctoral dissertation submitted in 1934, "*The Famous Victories of Henry the Fifth: A Critical Edition*," but not yet published, William Smith Wells recognizes the extant text as bad and reports that in his examination of it he found "extensive repetition of half-lines, lines, and even of whole passages, clear evidence that the 1598 edition is the product of memorial transmission."<sup>4</sup>

XVI. DEKKER, CHETTLE, WENTWORTH SMITH, AND WEBSTER'S  
*SIR THOMAS WYATT*

Two short statements made within the last five years seem to indicate that *Sir Thomas Wyatt* (Q1, 1607) is beginning to be recognized for what it is—a bad quarto. No good text exists. Miss Mary F. Martin, in December 1932, wrote: "The exceedingly poor style of *Wyat*, with its prose written as verse and verse as

<sup>1</sup> Greg, *Two Elizabethan Stage Abridgements*, p. 362.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 362.

<sup>3</sup> *The Massacre at Paris*, Malone Society Reprint, ed. W. W. Greg (1928), p. x.

<sup>4</sup> Abstracts of Dissertations, Stanford University, vol. x (1934-5), p. 47. On p. 48 Wells speaks of "the surviving 'bad' quarto of 1598."

prose, its geminations of lines, its halting rhythm, and its lack of coherence, points very clearly to the piracy of the play. . . . In fact, the style of *Wyat* is considerably worse than that of *If You Know Not Me*, a play known to be pirated."<sup>1</sup> More recently Miss Madeleine Doran has remarked, in speaking of *I If You Know Not Me* and *Sir Thomas Wyatt*, that "both appear to be reported texts."<sup>2</sup>

I quote some lines from the extant *Wyatt* which appear to be well reported :

*Mary.* By Gods asistance, and the power of heauen,  
After our Troubles we are safely set,  
In our inheritance, for which we doe subscribe  
The praise and benefit to God, next thanks  
To you my Lordes. Now shall the sanctuarie,  
And the house of the moste high be newly built.  
The ancient honours due vnto the Church,  
Buried within the Ruine Monastaries,  
Shall lift their stately heads, and rise againe  
To astonish the destroyers wandring eyes.  
Zeale shall be deckt in golde,  
Religion not like a virgin robd of all her pompe,  
But briefly shining in her Iemmes of state,  
Like a faire bride be offerd to the Lord.  
To build large houses, pull no churches downe,  
Rather inrich the Temple with our crowne.  
Better a poore Queene, then the Subiects poore.<sup>3</sup>

I now quote from the text where it is obviously very corrupt :

*Win :* Here comes the Heads-man, with the  
head of Iane.  
*Guil :* Who spake of Iane ? who namde my  
louely Iane ?  
*Win.* Behold her head.  
*Guil :* O I shall faint again !  
Yet let me beare this sight vnto my graue  
My sweete Ianes head :  
Looke Norfolke, Arundell, Winchester,  
Doe malefactors, looke :  
Thus when they die, a ruddie lippe,

<sup>1</sup> " *If You Know Not Me You Know Nobodie* and *The Famous Historie of Sir Thomas Wyatt*," *Library*, Fourth Series, XIII (1932-3), 274.

<sup>2</sup> *If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody, Part I*, Malone Society Reprint (1935), p. xviii.

<sup>3</sup> *The Famous History of Sir Thomas Wyatt* (1607), Tudor Facsimile Texts, ed. J. S. Farmer (1914), C3 verso—C4 recto.



A cleere reflecting eye,  
 Cheekes purer then the Maiden oreant pearle,  
 That sprinkles bashfulnes through the clowdes  
 Her innocence, has giuen her this looke :  
 The like for me to show so well being dead  
 How willingly would Guilford loose his head  
*Win*, My Lord, the time runs on.  
*Guil*, So does our death.  
 Heeres one has run so fast shee's out of breath,  
 But the time goes on,  
 And my faire Ianes white soule, wil be  
 In heauen before me  
 If I do stay : stay gentle wife,  
 Thy Guilford followes thee,  
 Though on the earth we part, by aduerse fate,  
 Our soules shall knock together at heauens gate.  
 The skie is calme, our deathes haue a faire day,  
 And we shall passe the smother on our way.  
 My Lords farwell, I once farwel to all,  
 The Fathers pride has causde the Childrens fall.<sup>1</sup>

## XVII. THE TRUE TRAGEDY OF RICHARD III

In 1929 Greg wrote of the quarto of *The True Tragedy of Richard III* (1594) :

The present play can never, one would suppose, have been anything but a strangely amateurish composition, but we can hardly believe that it has reached us in anything like the form given it by the unknown author. If Lord Marcus is really an error for Lord Marques, as suggested below, there must clearly have been an oral stage in the transmission, and the same would account for Catesby being called Casbie on his first appearance. The text certainly seems to be in a rather chaotic state. Some parts are written in straightforward if stilted prose, others in tolerable blank verse ; the end shows an irregular mixture of quatrains and couplets. In places, however, the prose tends to fall into verse cadence and even contains traces of rime, while at times the verse becomes irregular. There are passages, especially near the beginning, which might equally well be regarded as prose cut up into lengths or verse in the last stages of decay : there are also distinct fragments of fourteen couplets. It is hard to imagine that the play should have been deliberately composed in this manner.<sup>2</sup>

I certainly do not know why Greg did not name it a bad quarto. Chambers was less hesitant in 1930 : " It seems to be a reported

<sup>1</sup> G<sub>2</sub> verso—G<sub>3</sub> recto.

<sup>2</sup> *The True Tragedy of Richard III* (1594), Malone Society Reprint, ed. W. W. Greg (1929), pp. vi-vii.

text, in which much of the verse has been paraphrased in prose." <sup>1</sup> Q is definitely a bad quarto. As much evidence could be adduced for this statement as for the naming of any other bad quarto which cannot be complemented by a good text. Witness, for example, the following wreckage of "fourteeners":

*King.* Zownes, foe mee no foes, the fathers fact condemnes the sonne to die.

*Lou.* But guiltlesse blood will for reuengement crie.

*King.* Why was not he left for fathers loyaltie?

*Lou.* Therein his father greatly iniured him.

*King.* Did not your selues in presence, see the bondes sealde and assignde?

*Lo.* What tho my Lord, the vardits own, the titles doth resign.

*King.* The bond is broke and I will sue the fine, except you will hinder me, what will you haue it so?

*Lou.* In doing true iustice, else we answere no.<sup>2</sup>

#### XVIII. PEELE'S *EDWARD I*

Dyce (that excellent editor!) in his footnotes to his text of *The Famous Chronicle of King Edward the First, surnamed Edward Long shankes* (Q1, 1593) presents enough evidence to convince even the most conservative modern textual critic that Q is a bad quarto.<sup>3</sup> But since in the nineteenth century little was known about bad quartos, Dyce did not interpret the corruption correctly. In "Some Account of George Peele and His Writings" he pointed to the printer as the culprit: "In 1593 was printed our author's *Chronicle of Edward the First*, of which drama a second edition appeared in 1599. Both editions abound with the grossest typographical errors; here lines have dropped out; there verses are inserted where they ought not to stand: after a careful revision of the text, I have been obliged to leave some passages in a doubtful state, and others, which defy emendation, in all their old corruption."<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *William Shakespeare*, I. 304.

<sup>2</sup> Malone Society Reprint, vv. 1946-56.

<sup>3</sup> *The Dramatic and Poetical Works of Robert Greene and George Peele* (London, 1861), pp. 377-415. On the last page of his text, for example, Dyce has the following notes: "Before this line something is evidently wanting. . . . Some of these lines, with a little variation, have already been spoken by the king. . . . More corruption, and past cure. . . . The last scene of this drama is such a mass of confusion, that we cannot determine by whom the bodies of Queen Elinor and Joan are carried out."

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 338.

The following passage indicated how corrupt Q can be in its report of blank verse :

*Qu. Eli.* Then *Elinor* bethinke thee of a gift worthie the king of Englandes wife, and the king of Spaines daughter, and giue such a largis, that the Chronicles of this land may crake with record of thy liberalitie.

*Parturient montes : nascetur ridiculus mus.*

*shee makes a Cipher.*

There my lord, neither one, two, nor three,  
But a poore Cipher in Agrum, to inrich good fellowes,  
And compound their figure in their kinde.

*Longsh.* Madam I commend your composition,  
An argument of your honourable disposition :  
Sweete *Nell* thou shouldst not be thy selfe,  
Did not with thy mounting minde,  
Thy gift surmount the rest.

*Gloce.* Cal you this *Ridiculus mus*? mary sir this mouse  
Would make a foule hole in a faire Cheese,  
Tis but a Cipher in Agrum,  
And it hath made a 10000. pounds, 100000 pounds :

*Edmund.* A princely gift and worthy memorie.

*Glocester.* My gracious Lord, as erst I was assignde,  
Lieutenant to his Maiestie,  
Here render I vp the crowne left in charge with me,  
By your princely fater king *Henrie*,  
Who on his death bed still did call for you,  
And dying, wild to you the Diadem.

*Longshankes.* Thanks worthie Lordes,  
And seeing by doome of heauens it is decreed,  
And lawful line of our succession,  
Vnworthy *Edward* is become your king,  
We take it as a blessing from on hie,  
And wil our Coronation be solemnized,  
Vpon the 14. of December next.<sup>1</sup>

We remember that a common characteristic of bad quartos is anticipation or recollection of lines from another part of the play. A clear case of such corruption occurs in the extant text of *Edward I*. The two passages I cite are separated by more than seven hundred lines. I italicize the verses which must represent the same passage in the lost original :

*Omnes.* Amaine amaine vppon these treacherous Scottes.  
Amaine saie all, vppon these treacherous Scots,  
*Longsh.* While wee with *Edmund*, *Gloster*, and the rest,

<sup>1</sup> *King Edward the First* (1593), Malone Society Reprint, ed. W. W. Greg (1911), vv. 187-219.

*With speedie iournies gather vp our forces,  
 And beat these brauing Scots from Englands bounds,  
 Mortimor thou shalt take the route in taske,  
 That reuell here and spoile faire Cambria,  
 My Queene when shee is strong and well a foote,  
 Shall post to London and repaste her there,  
 Then God shall send vs happely all to meete,  
 And ioy the honors of our victories,  
 Take vantage of our foes and see the time,  
 Keepe stil our hold, our fight yet on the plaine,  
 Balioll I come proud Balioll and ingrate,  
 Perswaded to chase thy men from Englands gate.<sup>1</sup>*

*King.* How one affliction cals another ouer.  
 First death torments me, then I feele disgrace,  
 Againe *Lluellen* he rebels in Wales,  
 And false *Balioll* meanes to braue me to,  
 But I will finde prouision for them all,  
 My constancie shall conquer death and shame,  
 And *Mortimor* tis thou must hast to wales,  
 And rouse that Rebel from his starting holes,  
 And rid thy King of his contentious foe,  
 Whilst I with *Elinor*, *Gloster*, and the rest,  
 With speedie iourney gather vp our force,  
 And beat these brauing Scots from out own bounds,  
 Courage braue Souldiers fates hath done their worst,  
 Now Vertue let me triumphe in thine aide.<sup>2</sup>

#### XIX. FAIRE EM

The extant text of *Faire Em* (Q1, 1593 circa) is as mangled a bad quarto as can be found in the entire canon of "maimed and deformed" versions. Witness the following passage of blank verse:

*Em.* May not a maide look vpon a man  
 Without suspitious judgement of the world?  
*Manuile.* If sight do moue offence, it is the better not to see.  
 But thou didst more vnconstant as thou art,  
 For with them thou hadst talke and conference.  
*Em.* May not a maide talke with a man without mistrust?  
*Manuile.* Not with such men suspected amorous.  
*Em.* I grieue to see my *Manuiles* ielosie  
*Manuile.* Ah *Em*, faithfull loue is full of ielosie,  
 So did I loue thee true and faithfully,  
 For which I am rewarded most vnthankfully.  
*Exit in a rage, Manet Em.*

<sup>1</sup> *King Edward the First* (1593), Malone Society Reprint, ed. W. W. Greg (1911), vv. 2,235-2,251.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, vv. 2,943-2,956.

And so awaie ? what is displeasure gone ?  
 And left me such a bitter sweete to gnawe vpon ?  
 Ah *Manuile*, little watterest thou,  
 How neere this parting goeth to my heart.  
 Vncourteous loue whose followers reapes reward,  
 Of hate, disdaine, reproach and infamie,  
 The fruit of frantike, bedlome ieloizie.

*Here enter Mountney to Em.*

But here comes one of these suspitious men :  
 Witness my God without desert of me :  
 For onely *Manuile* honor I in harte :  
 Nor shall vnkindnes cause me from him to starte.<sup>1</sup>

I cannot understand Greg's refusal to recognize Q as a bad quarto. He writes :

The printed text is very short, running to little over 1500 lines, and may not preserve the play in its full form. The wording of the title-page looks authoritative ; on the other hand, the possible connection with Danter as printer, the presence of the initials only of two young and obscure booksellers as publishers, and the absence of entry in the Register, combine to raise some suspicion as to the provenance of the text. When this has received more minute analysis than its editors have hitherto bestowed upon it something of its history will perhaps be revealed. Meanwhile a mere impression may be recorded for what it is worth. It would seem in the first place that the play has been abridged almost to the point of obscuring the action. But in the second place the text is not all of a piece. While the defects of the earlier portion can perhaps be accounted for by rather drastic cutting, this will hardly explain the bald crudity of the later scenes. Some of these, though printed as verse, seem to consist for the most part of a mere prose summary which gives the essential meaning of the speeches with little attempt to reproduce the original wording. Occasional lines of verse are preserved, but there is no trace of the endeavour to work in or string together fragments which is evident in most cases of reconstruction from memory.<sup>2</sup>

However, Q contains as much ascertainable evidence of memorization as any bad quarto for which a good text does not exist—*The Famous Victories of Henry V*, for example. I cite the following repetitions of lines and phrases :

- 135 The true discoverers of a Virgins due
- 153 Shall in perseverance of a Virgins due

<sup>1</sup> *Fair Em*, Malone Society Reprint, ed. W. W. Greg (1927), vv. 440-463.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. ix-x.

- 292 *Valingford* Goe *William Conqueror* and seeke thy loue.  
 293 Seeke thou a mynion in a forren land  
 294 Whylest I drawe back and court my loue at home,  
 311 Goe *William Conqueror* and seke thy loue,  
 312 Whylest I drawe back and court mine owne the while.  
 607 And makes him conceiue and conster his intent,  
 678 Nor let my loue misconster my intente,  
 666 Be it no impeachment to my honest fame.  
 750 An it be no impeachment to my chastitie :  
 1151 Maister *Manuile* hath forsaken her  
 1152 And at Chester shalbe married to a mans daughter of no little wealth.  
 1200 *Valingford*. Why faire *Em*, *Manuile* hath forsaken thee,  
 1201 And must at Chester be married, . . .  
 1214 Maister *Manuile* hath forsaken thee,  
 1215 And at Chester must be married  
 1216 To a mans daughter of no little wealth.

Much more evidence of this type could be brought forward—particularly the recurring phenomenon of a speaker's first line repeating the last line of the previous speaker or using a phrase from it. One's conclusion, however, that Q is bad need not depend on such particulars. It should be based on its general likeness to other bad quartos.

#### XX. *GEORGE A GREENE*

The present writer is the first to recognize the wretched and extremely short extant text of *George a Greene* as a bad quarto (1599). It is clearly as "maimed and deformed" a report as *Orlando Furioso*. The following lines cannot conceivably be as the author wrote them (vv. 543-82) :

*George*. Marie this, my Lord, I muse,  
 If thou be Henrie Mornford Kendals Earle,  
 That thou wilt doe poore G. a Greene this wrong,  
 Euer to match me with a troupe of men.  
*Kend*. Why doest thou strike me then ?  
*Geor*. Why my Lord, measure me but by yonr [*sic*] selfe :  
 Had you a man had seru'd you long,  
 And heard your foe misuse you behinde your backe,  
 And would not draw his sword in your defence,  
 You would cashere him.  
 Much more, king Edward is my king :



And before Ile heare him so wrong'd,  
 Ile die within this place,  
 And maintaine good whatsoeuer I haue said.  
 And if I speake not reason in this case,  
 What I haue said Ile maintaine in this place  
*Bon.* A pardon my Lord for this pinner,  
 For trust me he speaketh like a man of worth.  
*Kend.* Well, George, wilt thou leaue Wakefelde and,  
 Wend with me,  
 Ile freely put vp all and pardon thee.  
*Georg.* I my Lord, considering me one thing,  
 You will leaue these armes and follow your good king.  
*Ken.* Why George, I rise not against king Edward,  
 But for the poore that is opprest by wrong,  
 And if King Edward will redresse the same,  
 I will not offer him disparagement,  
 But otherwise ; and so let this suffice :  
 Thou hear'st the reason why I rise in armes.  
 Nowe wilt thou leaue Wakefield, and wend with me,  
 Ile make thee captaine of a hardie band,  
 And when I haue my will, dubbe thee a knight.  
*George.* Why, my Lord, haue you any hope to winne ?  
*Kend.* Why, there is a prophecie doeth say,  
 That King Iames and I shall meete at London,  
 And make the King vaile bonnet to vs both.  
*Geo.* If this were true, my Lord, this were a mighty reason  
*Ken.* Why, it is a miraculous prophecie, and cannot faile,  
*George.* Well, my Lord, you haue almost turned me.<sup>1</sup>

The text has obviously gone through a stage of memorization. Evidence of memorial contamination appears throughout. I present the most striking example, the same passage found in two different parts of the play as it stands :

vv. 605-610

*George.* Why then, to honour G. a Greene the more,  
 Vouchsafe a peece of beefe at my poore-house,  
 You shall haue wafer cakes your fill,  
 A peece of beefe hung vp since Martilmas,  
 If that like you not, take what you bring for me.

vv. 1,093-1,101

*George.* Robin Hood ? next to king Edward  
 Art thou leef to me :  
 Welcome, sweet Robin, welcome, mayd Marian,

<sup>1</sup> The text and numbering are from the Malone Society Reprint, ed. F. W. Clarke and W. W. Greg (1911).

And welcome, you my friends.  
 Will you to my poore house,  
 You shall haue wafer cakes your fill,  
 A peece of beefe hung vp since Martlemas,  
 Mutton and veale, if this like you not,  
 Take that you finde, or that you bring for me.

# XXI. BEAUMONT AND FLETCHER'S *PHILASTER*

Q1 (1620) and Q2 (1622) of *Philaster* were published by Thomas Walkley. Let me quote his preface to Q2, which presents a different text from that of Q1 :

Courteous Reader. *Philaster*, and *Arethusa* his loue, haue laine so long a bleeding, by reason of some dangerous and gaping wounds, which they receiued in the first Impression, that it is wondered how they could goe abroad so long, or trauaile so farre as they haue done. Although they were hurt neither by me, nor the Printer ; yet I knowing and finding by experience, how many well-wishers they haue abroad, haue aduentured to bind vp their wounds, & to enable them to visite upon better tearmes, such friends of theirs, as were pleased to take knowledge of them, so mained [*sic*] and deformed, as they at the first were ; and if they were then gracious in your sight, assuredly they will now finde double fauour, being reformed, and set forth suteable, to their birth, and breeding.<sup>1</sup>

Q1 is a bad quarto. The play as Beaumont and Fletcher wrote it was first given by Q2. Such "mishearings" as the following indicate that Q1 cannot possibly be a transcript of the author's text :<sup>2</sup>

## Q1 (I. i. 212-3)

I doe not fancy this choller,  
 Sure hee's somewhat tainted.

## Q2

I doe not fancie this,  
 Call our Physitions ? Sure he's somewhat tainted.

## Q1 (II. ii. 48-9)

Shee's daintie, and must be courted with a shower of gold,

## Q2

she's a *Danae*, and must be courted in a showre of gold.

<sup>1</sup> My quotations from Q1 and Q2 are from photostats of copies in the Huntington Library.

<sup>2</sup> I employ the line numbering of P. A. Daniel's edition of *Philaster* in *The Works of Beaumont and Fletcher, Variorum Edition* (London, 1904), I. 137-242.

Q1 (III. i. 54-5)

but my designes are not yet ripe sufficient,

Q2

but my designes

Are not yet ripe, suffice it,

Comparison of Q1 and Q2 reveals in the former all the phenomena of bad quartos: more "mishearings" like those above, addition, omission, substitution, restatement, transposition, mislining, corrupt blank verse, and the giving of speeches to the wrong characters. This is a sample of what one finds:

Q1 (I. i. 259-66)

*Leon.* I cannot blame him, theres danger int.

Euery man in this age has a soule of Christall, to read their actions, though mens faces are so farre asunder, that they hold no intelligence: but view the stranger well, and you shall see a feauer throw all his braueries, and feele him shackle like a true truant, if he giue not back his Crowne againe, vpon the report of an elder gun: I am no augery.

Q2

*Di.* I cannot blame him, there's danger in't. Euery man in this age, has not a soule of Christall, for all men to reade their actions through: mens hearts and faces are so farre asunder, that they hold no intelligence. Doe but view yon stranger well, and you shall see a feauer through all his brauery, and feele him shake like a true tenant; if he giue not back his Crowne againe, vpon the report of an Elder gun, I haue no augury.

## NOTE

There is reason to believe that Q1 of *A Maid's Tragedy* is a bad quarto: I have been unable to examine it. Despite protestations to the contrary, *The Taming of A Shrew* does not stand in relation to *The Shrew* as *The True Tragedie*, for example, stands in relation to *3 Henry VI*.

## RALPH KNEVETT, AUTHOR OF THE SUPPLEMENT TO SPENSER'S FAERIE QUEENE

BY C. BOWIE MILLICAN

FOR many years queries have been made concerning the authorship of *A Supplement of the Faery Queene* ("finished . . . 1635"), MS. Ee. 3. 53 in the University Library, Cambridge,<sup>1</sup> but the only solution thus far suggested is that in the Cambridge *Catalogue* of manuscripts, which points inconclusively towards Robert Jegon of Buxton, Norfolk: "The only trace of authorship [in the manuscript] occurs at the foot of an address 'Spencero Posthumo,'<sup>2</sup> which has been designedly erased. The signature appears to be 'Rob: Jagan (or Jegon), armiger.' Was this Robert Jegon, of Buxton, Norfolk, son of Bp. Jegon, who died in 1617?"<sup>3</sup> Scholars have continued to echo this tentative suggestion, and at least one has accepted Jegon, with no more authority, as author of the *Supplement*.<sup>4</sup>

It has not been pointed out, however, that the *Supplement* manuscript is a holograph and that the handwriting of the cancelled "address" "Spencero Posthumo," a Latin poem in elegiac distichs, and of the signature "Rob: Jegon Armiger" which follows it (this signature also being cancelled),<sup>5</sup> is the same as that of the text, including title-page and prefatory matter. Nor has sufficient attention been given to the substance of the Latin poem, which

<sup>1</sup> See, e.g., *Notes and Queries*, 8th Ser., I (1892), p. 273; 9th Ser., IX (1902), p. 28; 10th Ser., XI (1909), p. 190. In this account of the *Supplement* and its author I have not aimed at completeness, for I shall acknowledge my obligations in full and discuss the author and his works in more detail in the edition of the manuscript that I have in preparation. For brief considerations of the poem, see my *Spenser and the Table Round* ([Mar. 16], 1932), pp. 137-40, and Roberta Florence Brinkley, *Arthurian Legend in the Seventeenth Century* ([May 5], 1932), pp. 108-10.

<sup>2</sup> Verso of the 6th unnumbered folio.

<sup>3</sup> *A Catalogue of the Manuscripts Preserved in the Library of the University of Cambridge* [ed. C. Hardwick], II (1857), p. 90.

<sup>4</sup> Miss Brinkley (as above), pp. 109, 216, but cf. pp. 108, 177. Miss Brinkley is followed in error by an anonymous reviewer in *The Times Literary Supplement*, No. 1,590 (July 21, 1932), p. 521.

<sup>5</sup> The surname is clearly "Jegon," and not "Jagan" which the Cambridge *Catalogue* offers as a first alternative.

apparently has been misread or misinterpreted, or unread or uninterpreted, for as the restored text will show, this poem, instead of being composed by the author of the *Supplement*, is a tribute addressed to him as "Spencerus Posthumus" or "Spencerus Rediuius":

Spencero Posthumo.

Perficere Herculeos pergis (Spencere) labores ;

Heu finem coëptis<sup>1</sup> invida fata negant,

At te Pierides prohibent periase sorores ;

Vela dabit famæ Posthumus ecce tue :

Et veluti Phariâ Volucris nutritus in orâ,

Gaudet axem proprio restituisse rogo :

Haud aliter nostrum letantur sæcula Vatem,

Spencerum calamo viuificesse suo.

Dignam te, Musisque refers (rediuiue) poesin,

Nec minor est virtus, fama perennis erit.

Rob: Jegon

Armiger.\*

It is not necessary, therefore, to rely upon evidence of the handwriting of any possible Robert Jegon to eliminate him from the authorship. The author of the *Supplement*, whoever he was, simply copied into his text a complimentary poem written for the special occasion of his work. Whether or not the poem has been "designedly erased," the "chain" method of cancellation employed in this case is similar to the style of cancellation which the author of the *Supplement* frequently employs in the body of his own verses.

Actually the only possible clue to the identity of the author that is to be found in the manuscript, a point which has been overlooked, occurs on page 226 in a cancelled couplet "To the Reader" that is not in the handwriting of the rest of the manuscript :

Our worthie Kneuet's praise aryaes ((hence sir))

In that he studies for to perfect Spencer

These lines of commendation with the attribution of the poem to a "Kneuet" are sufficient, in connection with other items of evidence, to prove that the author is Ralph Knevett, also of Norfolk, who is known to have been connected with the Paston family of Oxnead.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> MS. : coëptis.

<sup>2</sup> A translation follows : "You strive, O Spencer, to complete Herculean labours ; alas, fates hostile to things begun deny the completion, but the Pierian sisters prevent you from perishing ; behold, Posthumous will set sail to your fame : and just as the bird nourished on the Pharian shore rejoices to have restored the heavens by his own funeral pile, even so do the ages exult that our poet by his own pen has brought Spencer to life. You are writing poetry, O Renewed One, worthy of yourself and of the Muses : nor is your courage less ; your fame will be everlasting."

<sup>3</sup> See my preliminary announcement, "Ralph Knevett's *Supplement of the Faery Queene*," in *The Times Literary Supplement*, No. 1,758 (October 10, 1935), p. 635.

They lead logically to Sir Sidney Lee's short article on Knevet in the *Dictionary of National Biography* and thence to British Museum MS. Add. 27,447, which contains *A Gallery to the Temple*, Knevet's collection of poems written, according to his own words on the title-page, "For the Honorable S<sup>r</sup> Robert Pastons Lady." Therefore, the identification of Knevet as the author of the *Supplement* is established by the following facts: first, the *Supplement* manuscript is undoubtedly a holograph; second, the handwriting of the *Supplement* manuscript is identical with that of the *Gallery* manuscript, which is also holographic and which carries in the same hand the signature "Ra: Kneuet" both on title-page and at the bottom of the preface.

That the *Supplement* manuscript is a holograph is shown by numerous considerations, and a comparative examination of the questioned handwriting of this manuscript and the unquestioned handwriting of the *Gallery* manuscript reveals overwhelming details of identity. Moreover, in both manuscripts the orthography is often strikingly like that of later centuries and has consistently deviating peculiarities. And add to this identity of handwriting and of peculiarities in orthography the tone of the subject matter of poem upon poem in the *Gallery* for groups of stanzas in the *Supplement*, and no further evidence need be adduced, unless one wishes to compare the style of all these verses, especially the Spenserian stanzas of the *Supplement*, with that of *Funerall Elegies* by "Ra. Knevet" (published in 1637 in memory of Lady Katherine Paston), the third elegy of which is made up of twenty Spenserian stanzas. In all the verses of these works the same author unmistakably reveals himself.

Only one section of the *Supplement* proper furnishes probable confirmatory internal evidence concerning the identity of the author: namely, the continued account, in the seventh canto of Book VIII, of Elizabeth's intervention in behalf of the Netherlands against Philip II of Spain and, eventually, Catholic Europe. From the untimely death at Zutphen of "noble Astrophell," that "matchles Knight"—or actually from the entry of Sir Gorman, or Sir Thomas Morgan, who captained the first English volunteers in 1572—Knevet carries the story of England's participation on through the death of Auranion, or Maurice of Nassau, Prince of Orange, Stadholder from 1587 to 1625, to his brother Uranion, or Frederick Henry, Prince of Orange, Stadholder from 1625 to 1647.



And, significantly enough, among the English knights included in the later stages of the "doubtfull warre" is Sir Bertufort, "rampeing Lion . . . in the field," "gentle lambe in Court,"<sup>1</sup> who is patently Sir Robert Bertie (or Bertue), twelfth Baron Willoughby de Eresby and first Earl of Lindsey (1572-1642),<sup>2</sup> the father of Lady Katherine Paston, Knevet's benefactress.

Of the life of Ralph Knevet little has been known or assembled beyond the fact that he was a native of Norfolk.<sup>3</sup> But it is certain that he was connected for a number of years with the family of Sir William Paston, Bart., of Oxnead. Sir Sidney Lee suggests, but offers no evidence, that he was tutor or chaplain in the Paston household.<sup>4</sup>

Ralph Knevet was undoubtedly the "Raphe Nevett sonne of Raphe Nevett & Alis his wiff" who was baptized at Hardwick on February 19, 1601/02.<sup>5</sup> On September 3, 1616, he was admitted pensioner at Peterhouse, Cambridge, as "Radulphus Nevett Norfolciensis."<sup>6</sup> He matriculated in the University under the date of July 5, 1617,<sup>7</sup> but there is no evidence either at Peterhouse or in the University Registry that he advanced to a degree, even though he later styles himself "in artibus Magister."<sup>8</sup> His name

<sup>1</sup> Stanza 51, p. 303.

<sup>2</sup> See *D.N.B.* If one insists that Sir Bertufort represents rather Sir Robert's father, Peregrine, eleventh Baron Willoughby de Eresby (1555-1601), who was actively engaged in the Netherlands for a longer while, yet the significance of the identification as concerns Knevet is not in the least affected. However, that the reference is to Sir Robert would seem to be established by Knevet's sequence of the names of the English knights. In the preceding stanza

" . . . stout S<sup>r</sup> Deueron whom Lamia's lust,  
With cursed spells, and wicked artifice  
Had whilome nigh layd low in dust,"

clearly represents Robert Devereux, third Earl of Essex (1591-1646), son of the famous second Earl by Frances Walsingham Sidney: his marriage with Frances Howard was nullified in 1613 during one of the most scandalous affairs of the time.

<sup>3</sup> Since the owner of the name writes "Kneuet" in the *Gallery* manuscript, perhaps this preference should stand regardless of the spelling "Knevet" in his printed works. I use the spelling "Knyvet" when referring to the famous Norfolk family in general.

<sup>4</sup> *D.N.B.* Lee gives little more than a list of Knevet's known works, not including the *Supplement*, of course.

<sup>5</sup> Parish Register No. 1 (1561-1762) of St. Margaret's, Hardwick (consulted through the kindness of the Rev. F. P. Law, rector, and of E. C. Hawkins, Esq., Shelton Hall).

<sup>6</sup> Peterhouse *Admission Book* (1615-1748), f. 2<sup>r</sup> (as numbered); cf. T. A. Walker, *Admissions to Peterhouse* (1912), p. 4.

<sup>7</sup> Cambridge *Matriculations* (1613-1709).

<sup>8</sup> Venn lists him as LL.B., 1624, but obviously confuses him with the "Rodolphus Nevill" of Trinity Hall who was admitted to the degree of LL.B. in that year. See *The Book of Matriculations and Degrees* (1913), p. 485 (cf. p. 405).

is first entered in the Peterhouse Buttery Book under the date of September 7, 1616, and it last appears therein among the entries for December 19, 1618.

In 1624 William Paston was admitted fellow-commoner at Corpus Christi, Cambridge, in 1626/27 he commenced B.A.,<sup>1</sup> and shortly thereafter he married Lady Katherine Bertie, daughter of Sir Robert Bertie, who, as I have shown, is the Sir Bertufort of the *Supplement*. This William Paston, who was created baronet in the 1640's, was the son of Sir Edmund Paston by his wife Katherine Knyvett,<sup>2</sup> daughter of Sir Thomas Knyvett the elder of Ashwellthorpe, who was buried on February 9, 1617/18,<sup>3</sup> and this blood relationship of the Pastons and the Knyvetts may well explain Ralph Knevet's close association with the Pastons.

As early as 1628 Knevet, in his *Στρατιωτικόν*, or a *Discourse of Militarie Discipline*,<sup>3</sup> addressed verses to William Paston, apparently before the young heir had taken up residence at Oxnead Hall. This work, largely in verse, is dedicated "To the Most worthy and experienced *Captaine, the Lieutenant and all the well Disciplined companie, Trained vp in the Militarie yard at Norwich*," and is signed "Ra. Kneuet." Also prefacing the text proper there are further words in both prose and verse signed respectively "RA. KNEVET" and "R.K." which serve to introduce verses by Knevet to thirty-seven men who were connected with the military organization in Norwich, and the parade of names begins with Captain Henry Shelton. Among these names is "M<sup>r</sup> WILLIM POSTON [*i.e.* William Paston] of Paston." Among other names of interest in the list are "M<sup>r</sup>. THOMAS KNEVET of Ashwell Thorpe," who follows directly after Captain Henry Shelton, and

and *Alumni Cantabrigienses*, Part I, Vol. III (1924), p. 28, and *cf.* Cambridge Subscriptions (1613-1638), p. 186, and *Supplicats* (1624-1626), p. 108.

<sup>1</sup> Corpus Christi Register (1590-1698), p. 159; *The Book of Matriculations and Degrees*, p. 513; *Alumni Cantabrigienses* (as above), p. 318.

<sup>2</sup> Walter Rye, *Norfolk Families* [1911-1913], p. 653.

<sup>3</sup> Parish Register of All Saints', Ashwellthorpe (information from the Rev. Canon E. S. Fardell, rector). See *D.N.B.* under "KNYVET OR KNEVET, SIR EDMUND (d. 1546)"; *Le Neve's Pedigrees of the Knights*, ed. G. W. Marshall (Harl. Soc., VIII, 1873), pp. 21-3; Rye, *Norfolk Families*, p. 452; and *cf.* F. V. Duleep Singh, "The Knyvett Family," in *The Norfolk Antiquarian Miscellany*, ed. Rye, 2d Ser., Part 3 (1908), p. 87. For pedigrees of the Knyvett family, see, among countless items in manuscript, British Museum Harl. 4756, ff. 4<sup>r</sup>-8<sup>r</sup>, and Miss Katherine Knyvet Wilson, *History of the Knyvets and Wilsons* (now the property of B. Knyvet Wilson, Esq., Crossways, Cringleford, Norwich).

<sup>4</sup> *Short-title Catalogue*, p. 338, No. 15037, a presumably unique copy in the Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery, San Marino, California, the authorities of which have kindly granted me permission to quote from the work.

"M<sup>r</sup> EDMVND KNEVET," these Knyvett brothers being sons of Sir Thomas Knyvett the younger of Ashwellthorpe, who died in 1605, and hence first cousins of William Paston.

For some ten years following the publication of the *Discourse*, Knevett must have lived in intimate relationship with the Pastons at Oxnead, for his *Funerall Elegies* (1637),<sup>1</sup> which has already been referred to, was called forth by the death, on December 30, 1636, of Lady Katherine.<sup>2</sup> The dedication, signed "*Ra. Knevett*," is addressed to "*Lady Elizabeth Bertue*," sister of the deceased and "*Daughter to the right Noble, and most accomplished Lord, ROBERT Earle of Lindsey, &c.*" To her the author makes "*acknowledgement of those great engagements and duties*" which he owes to the memory of Lady Paston and refers to himself as "*her most unworthy beneficiary*." Three elegies, in the main, compose the text of the memorial volume. In the first elegy Knevett, apostrophizing Lady Elizabeth, mentions the "*streams of cristall Bure*"—"The name of the river running at the foot of *Oxned*." The third elegy is, as remarked above, significantly made up of twenty Spenserian stanzas, Knevett being prompted to continue with the stanzaic form of the *Supplement*, which he had finished, according to his own statement, but two years before. His eulogy of his benefactress closes with an "*Inscriptio funebris*" and an "*Epicidium*," both of which appear on the mural monument to Lady Katherine in St. Michael's, Oxnead.

In 1631 there had already appeared Knevett's play *Rhodon and Iris*,<sup>3</sup> with a dedication to Nicholas Bacon of Gillingham signed "RA. KNEVET." Described on the title-page as "*A PASTORALL*," it was presented, as the title-page again indicates, "*at the FLORISTS Feast in Norwich, May 3, 1631.*"<sup>4</sup>

Knevett's last known work, *A Gallery to the Temple*,<sup>5</sup> the signed

<sup>1</sup> *Short-title Catalogue*, No. 15035, a presumably unique copy in the British Museum (G. 11.473).

<sup>2</sup> For the correct date of her death, as distinguished from the date of her burial (January 3, 1636/37), see Anthony Norris, *Hundred of Tunstead (Collections, III, Rye MS. No. 3, Norwich Public Library)*, p. 390.

<sup>3</sup> With two imprints, *Short-title Catalogue*, Nos. 15036 and 15036\*.

<sup>4</sup> For accounts of the play, with some conflicting discussion, see Homer Smith, "Pastoral Influence in the English Drama," *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, xii (1897), pp. 428-37; Josephine Laidler, "A History of Pastoral Drama in England until 1700," *Englische Studien*, xxxv (1905), pp. 228-30; W. W. Greg, *Pastoral Poetry & Pastoral Drama* (1906), pp. 351-4.

<sup>5</sup> Ff. 11'-67' (ff. 11' and 67' are blank) of British Museum MS. Add. 27.447, which, together with MS. Add. 27.448, composes two volumes of "Correspondence and Papers of the family of Paston, afterwards Earls of Yarmouth."

holograph manuscript-collection of lyrics that led conclusively to the identification of him as the author of the *Supplement*, shows his further connection with the Paston family of Oxnead. In Knevet's own hand on the title-page is the notation that the verses are "For the Honorable S<sup>r</sup> Robert Pastons Lady,"<sup>1</sup> who was born Rebecca, daughter of Sir Jasper Clayton. Robert Paston, who was admitted fellow-commoner at Trinity College, Cambridge, on March 10, 1645/46, but left without taking a degree,<sup>2</sup> was knighted on May 27, 1660, and he succeeded as second baronet on the death of his father, Sir William, in 1662/63.<sup>3</sup> Since, therefore, the *Gallery* was written professedly in emulation of "Pious Herbert,"<sup>4</sup> it must have been begun some time after 1633, the date of the first edition of Herbert's *Temple*—or even after 1635, when Knevet says the *Supplement* was finished—and the lyrics must have occupied the author's time for a number of years, since he could not appropriately have made the presentation to Lady Paston before 1660. A rough *terminus a quo* may be indicated by the opening lines of the third poem in the collection, "The Deprecation":

(Lord) cease this direfull tintamarre  
Of ciuill warre.

Knevet's writing of religious verse, moreover, is of further interest in view of the fact that he was rector of St. Michael's, Lyng, from 1652/53 until his death in 1671.<sup>5</sup> This fact is established by a comparison of the handwriting of "Radulphus Kneuet Rector" in the parish register of St. Michael's with that of "Ra: Kneuet" of the *Gallery* manuscript, and thus affords additional evidence for the identification of Knevet as the author of the *Supplement*. Knevet, as rector, followed Thomas Howlett, who was buried on November 8, 1652, and a baptismal entry in the register in Knevet's

Fourteen of the poems in the *Gallery* are quoted by L. Birkett Marshall in his *Rare Poems of the Seventeenth Century* (1936), pp. 126-40.

<sup>1</sup> Also, on a slip of paper pasted on the bottom of the title-page, there is written "For my Lady Paston"; this too in Knevet's hand.

<sup>2</sup> *Admissions to Trinity College, Cambridge*, ed. W. W. Rouse Ball and J. A. Venn, II (1913), p. 389; *The Book of Matriculations and Degrees*, p. 513.

<sup>3</sup> *D.N.B.*; *Alumni Cantabrigienses* (as above), p. 317.

<sup>4</sup> "To The Reader," f. 12<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>5</sup> Lee, in *D.N.B.* (drawing upon Francis Blomefield's *Norfolk*), says that the poet is probably identical with the rector, then proceeds to turn his suggestion into an assumption of fact, and on no other evidence fixes the inclusive dates of Knevet's life at 1600-1671. T. A. Walker and others follow Lee. Greg states that "after the restoration [Knevet] held the living of Lyng in Norfolk" (*Pastoral Poetry & Pastoral Drama*, p. 351).

hand occurs as early as February 12, 1652/53.<sup>1</sup> I find no record of Knevett's being instituted or inducted. He did not subscribe until September 20, 1662,<sup>2</sup> and on the following day he was ordained by Edward Reynolds, Bishop of Norwich.<sup>3</sup> His last entry in the parish register of Lyng is a baptism on November 21, 1669. The date of his death is not recorded in the register, but 1671 is the year given on the slab of Purbeck marble that marks his tomb within the chancel of St. Michael's :

HERE LYETH THE BODY OF/ RALPH KNYVET LATE RECTOR/  
OF THIS CHVRCH WHY DYED Y/ OF ANNO DOM/ 1671  
AG 71<sup>4</sup>

Therefore, since his will is dated January 22, 1671[/72], and since it was proved on July 16, 1672,<sup>5</sup> he must have died between the date of the will and March 25, 1672.

In view of the many juxtapositions of Norfolk names in connection with Knevett's literary attempts—to revert to the *Supplement*—it is not surprising to find in the continuation of *The Faerie Queene* the Latin poem "Spencero Posthumo" followed by "Rob: Jegon Armiger," both the cancelled poem and the signature being in Knevett's handwriting, as I have shown. There is no doubt whatever that this Robert Jegon, "Armiger," was Robert Jegon of Buxton, which, on the west bank of the river Bure, is little more than a Scottish mile from Oxnead, the old seat of the Pastons.<sup>6</sup> Robert was the elder of the two sons of John Jegon, D.D., formerly Master of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, who was elected Bishop of Norwich on January 18, 1602/03, and who died in that office at Aylsham on March 13, 1617/18.<sup>7</sup> Robert was baptized on

<sup>1</sup> These and other details from the Lyng parish register have kindly been furnished by the Rev. E. C. Weddall, present rector.

<sup>2</sup> Norwich Diocesan Records, Diocesan Registry, *Subscription Book* (March, 1660–May, 1670).

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, *Consignation Book* (1662), f. 16<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> From a rubbing furnished by the Rev. Weddall. The blanks in the inscription may indicate that the stone was placed to the memory of Knevett at a much later date.

<sup>5</sup> Norwich Archdeaconry, District Probate Registry, *Norwich Wills*, 1672–1673 ("fleetham 1672:1673"), ff. 111<sup>v</sup>–112<sup>r</sup>; original will: No. 82 (1672).

<sup>6</sup> Both places are in the South Erpingham hundred. The rectory of St. Michael's, Oxnead, is now consolidated with that of St. Andrew's, Buxton. See William White, *History, Gazetteer and Directory of Norfolk*, 4th ed. (1883), pp. 184, 626; J. C. Cox, *Norfolk, County Churches* [6], 2d ed. rev. (1911), I. 147–8, 157–8; Julia G. Longe, "The Pastons and Their Homes," in *Memorials of Old Norfolk*, ed. H. J. D. Astley (1908), pp. 310–14.

<sup>7</sup> The Latin inscription on Bishop Jegon's mural monument within the

September 12, 1610, while his father yet lived at Ludham Hall, the principal residence of the Bishop of Norwich.<sup>1</sup> Upon the death of his father he inherited the manor of Buxton Burgh with Kineshall, as well as the advowson of St. Andrew's, Buxton.<sup>2</sup> In 1624, in the same year with William Paston, he was admitted fellow-commoner at Corpus Christi, but he did not take a degree.<sup>3</sup> About 1629 he married Margâret Robinson, daughter of Sir Arthur Robinson of Deighton, Yorkshire.<sup>4</sup> The date of his death is not known. His wife died on December 4, 1638, according to the inscription on her mural monument in St. Andrew's, Buxton.

Since the Jegons of Aylsham and Buxton knew the Pastons of Oxnead, it follows, in view of Ralph Knevett's connection with the Pastons, that Robert Jegon was more than a mere acquaintance of his fellow Cantabrigian, the author of the *Supplement to The Faerie Queene*. Both Knevett and Jegon give further attestation to the influence of Pembroke's Spenser while the memory of "poore melancholy Colin," as Knevett in one place describes him, was yet green at the neighbouring colleges of Peterhouse and Corpus Christi.

chancel of St. Michael's, Aylsham, gives most of the principal dates and offices of his life, but see, among other items, the following: Robert Masters, *The History of the College of Corpus Christi* (1753), pp. 126-31; John Le Neve, *Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae*, corrected and continued by T. D. Hardy (1854), II. 470, 476; Rye, *Norfolk Families*, pp. 401-2; *Alumni Cantabrigienses*, Part I, Vol. II (1922), p. 466.

<sup>1</sup> Parish Register No. 1 (1583-1685) of St. Catherine's, Ludham, entry No. 469 (information from the Rev. B. P. Mohan, vicar).

<sup>2</sup> Blomefield, *Norfolk*, continued by Charles Parkin, III (1806), p. 564, vi (1807), pp. 443, 446.

<sup>3</sup> *Corpus Christi Register* (1590-1698), p. 159; *The Book of Matriculations and Degrees*, p. 383; *Alumni Cantabrigienses* (as above), p. 466, where there is no longer need for the cautionary "Perhaps s. and h. of John (1567); age c. 10 in 1617. If so, of Buxton, Norfolk, Esq." Robert was seven years old in 1617.

<sup>4</sup> Blomefield, *Norfolk*, vi (1807), p. 448; Joseph Hunter, *Familiae Minorum Gentium*, ed. J. W. Clay, II (Harl. Soc., XXXVIII, 1895), pp. 627-8.



## THE STAGE AND THE AUTHORITIES, 1700-1714 (AS REVEALED IN THE NEWSPAPERS)

By ALFRED JACKSON

ALTHOUGH the stage had experienced difficulties during the reign of King Charles II<sup>1</sup> it had nevertheless received royal favour, and was consequently fearless of public censure and rebukes from magisterial authorities. It served its function in satisfying the hilarious taste of the Court, and although this taste, with its ridicule of priests and married life,<sup>2</sup> may have been depraved, it was well adapted to the times. The decent people like Pepys could shake their heads at the general coarseness, but realized that it was the mode and would pass eventually.<sup>3</sup> After Charles, however, a change is perceptible in the position of the stage. It is no longer a Court monopoly; rather is it a fashionable rendezvous, a place where the moneyed classes, the titled people, and the wits commingled and fraternized. Although still exhibiting the predilections of its former audiences and endeavouring to please the new, it was now cut off from Court protection. It was open to everybody's censure: a chopping-block for social reformers; a place of ridicule for satirists; a political arena for parties, and a morsel for local authorities on which to sharpen their teeth. Queen Mary, moreover, pious and unaffected, had brought in a gradual influence for moral restraint; <sup>4</sup> the Puritan element, which had lain dormant for three decades, raised its head; "reform" became the watchword. With the awakening of national conscience, the Societies for the Reformation of Manners spread, connected themselves with the middle class in its struggle for recognition,<sup>5</sup> and created a stir which lasted until the coming of the Wesleys. The stage was naturally

<sup>1</sup> See Nicoll, *History of Restoration Drama*, Handlist.

<sup>2</sup> For defence of eighteenth-century plays in this connection, see Elwin, *Playgoer's Handbook to Restoration Stage*.

<sup>3</sup> See Krutch, *Comedy and Conscience after the Restoration*, Chap. II

<sup>4</sup> Ward, *English Dramatic Literature*, III. 509.

<sup>5</sup> Krutch, Chap. II.

an idol to be broken—but an idol which proved too solid for its iconoclasts.

It is possible to trace the troubles of the stage from 1696 with fair accuracy: the Proclamations are preserved at the British Museum, the Lord Chamberlain's records are extant at the Record Office, whilst the newspapers consistently note the attitude of the Justices and Grand Juries. Although the Royal Proclamations did not necessarily include the stage in their decrees against immorality, the bearing of the one on the other is too clear to be disregarded.

On January 24, 1696, the Lord Chamberlain ordered all plays to be fully licensed<sup>1</sup> owing to the failure of the managers to supply copies to the Master of the Revels,<sup>2</sup> and he followed this in the next year with a restriction on lewd expressions in stage plays.<sup>3</sup> These orders, supplementing as they did the preceding general animadversions against immorality,<sup>4</sup> the attacks of Blackmore in his *Prince Arthur*, and the strivings of the Society for the Restoration of Manners, prepared the way for a general onslaught. Early in 1698 came Meriton's *Immorality, Debauchery and Profaneness Expos'd*, a diatribe of little moment against contemporary amusements; then Collier in March bombarded the Town with his *Short View of the Immorality and Profaneness of the English Stage*. Contending that the end of art is morality, he attacked the immodesty, profanity, vicious nature, and irreligiosity of the stage with a fervent purpose which often led him into frivolous exaggeration.<sup>5</sup> The effect of the book is well-known, and the controversy it occasioned is made manifest by the enormous number of books and pamphlets which followed in its wake. For more than a year London became the scene of a fierce pamphlet war, a war which sometimes slackened, only to be resumed with renewed fierceness. It was still alive in 1708.<sup>6</sup> Three months after the publication of

<sup>1</sup> L.C. 7/1 and 7/3. Nicoll, *Restoration Drama*, p. 304.

<sup>2</sup> Betterton had complained in 1673 that he had been prosecuted in spite of his plays being overlooked by the Master of the Revels—L.C. 7/3.

<sup>3</sup> L.C. 5/152, June 4.

<sup>4</sup> November 17, 1676 (Brit. Mus. 1851. b. 2 (3)) *City of London against Profane Swearing &c.*, November 19, 1689 (Brit. Mus. 1851. b. 2 (14)) 1692 *Proclamation against Profane Persons* (Brit. Mus. C.21. f. 2 (35)).

<sup>5</sup> For full discussion of Collier and the Controversy, see Krutch, *op. cit.*, Chap. V; Gosse's *Life of Congreve*, 1924; Ward, *op. cit.*, p. 511; and Lowe's *Bibliography*.

<sup>6</sup> Perhaps Law may be said to have closed the controversy in 1726 with his *Absolute Unclassness of the Stage Entertainment fully dramatized*. See Gosse, p. 100.

the *Short View* the Middlesex Justices "did not only prosecute the play-houses but also Mr. Congreve for writing the *Double Dealer*, D'Urfey for *Don Quixote*, and Tonson and Brisco book-sellers for printing them; and that women frequenting the play-house in masks tended much to debauchery and immorality."<sup>1</sup> This was followed in February 1699 by a repeated order from the Lord Chamberlain discountenancing all lewd passages in plays.<sup>2</sup> No doubt the public were temporarily awed and the women were in difficulties, not knowing whether a play was decorous or not; yet, despite the frown of the justices, vizard masks became more popular than ever.

The new century opened with a fatal incident at Drury Lane when two "gentlemen quarrelled."<sup>3</sup> Naturally, this stirred the local magistrates to action, and on May 21:

The Grand Jury of London made a Presentation last Sessions against frequenting Playhouses as a Publick nuisance and a dangerous and growing evil, corrupting the morals and Principles of the Youth and desired that the Playhouse Bills might not be henceforth posted up in the City. Several Persons were fined last week for selling bawdy pictures.<sup>4</sup>

Meriton immediately thought it opportune to publish a second edition of his book,<sup>5</sup> and on June 15

a trial was brought on in the Court of Common Pleas against one of the Players for Prophaneity using the Name of God upon the Stage, contrary to an Act of Parliament made in King James the First's time, and that the verdict was given against the Player according to that Tenor of the said Act.<sup>6</sup>

Ten days later an Order of the Court of Common Council for London,

commanded all Persons concerned in Bartholomew Fair and in the sheds and booths . . . that they do not Let, Set, Hire or Use any Booth, Shed, Stall or other erection whatsoever to be used or employed for interludes. Stage-Plays, Comedies, Gaming-Places, Lotteries, disorderly Music Meetings . . . or other occasions for Enticing . . . loose and debauched people together under colour and pretence of innocent diversion.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Luttrell, *Brief Relation*, IV. 379.

<sup>2</sup> L.C. 5/152.

<sup>3</sup> *Post Man*, April 20/23, 1700. An actor had been murdered at the Rose Tavern in 1696—*Protestant Mercury*, May 1696. See also *Protestant Mercury*, April 19/24, 1700.

<sup>4</sup> *Flying Post*, May 18/21. See also Epilogue to Centlivre's *Perjur'd Husband*.

<sup>5</sup> *Flying Post*, May 28/31.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, June 13/15.

<sup>7</sup> *Brit. Mus.*, 1851, b. 25 (25).

Assailed from many directions, the stage had to tread warily, and it is interesting to read that on November 16, William Bowen, the

late famous Actor of the New Playhouse, being convinced by Mr. Collier's Book against the stage, and satisfied that a Shop-keeper's Life was more the readier way to Heaven of the two, opens a cane shop next door to the King's Head Tavern in Middle Row, Holbourn, where it is not questioned but all manner of Canes, Toys and other Curiosities will be sold at Reasonable Rates. This sudden change is much admired at as well as the reasons which induced him to leave such a profitable employ; but the most judicious concludes it is the effect of a certain Person's good Nature who has more compassion for his Soul than for his own.<sup>1</sup>

Apparently Bowen changed his mind again, as he returned to the stage later on.

On November 26 the Lord Chamberlain ordered that no woman in a mask was to be allowed to visit the theatres,<sup>2</sup> whilst three days later came another trial at the Common Pleas Bar against

one Hodgson the Player, for using prophanely and jestingly the name o God upon the Stage. The Action was founded upon the Statute of the 3d of King James the First which says that for every such offence the offender shall forfeit Ten Pounds; After hearing Council on both sides the Jury gave their Verdict against Mr. Hodgson who is to pay £10 accordingly.<sup>3</sup>

Matters were not improved when on December 16 there was a disturbance at Drury Lane "some people pelting the Auditors and Actors with oranges."<sup>4</sup> This possibly may have encouraged the Grand Jury of Middlesex to make the following Presentment:

<sup>1</sup> *Daily Courant*, November 16.

<sup>2</sup> Luttrell, *Brief Relation*, iv. 711.

<sup>3</sup> *Flying Post*, November 28/30; see Luttrell, iv. 712; *A representation of the Impiety and Immorality of the English Stage &c.*, which gives 1699. See also *Statutes of the Realm*, 1819, vol. iv, Part II, p. 1097:

#### AN ACTE TO RESTRAINE ABUSES OF PLAYERS.

FOR the p'venting and avoyding of the greate Abuse of the Holy Name of God in Stageplayes Interludes Maygames Shewes and such like; Be it enacted by our Sovereigne Lorde the King<sup>c</sup> Majesty, and by the Lordes Spirituall and Temporall, and Cōmons in this p'sent Parliament assembled, and by the authoritie of the same, That if at any tyme or tymes, after the end of this p'sent Session of Parliament, any pson or psons doe or shall in any Stage play Interlude Shewe Maygame or Pageant jestingly or pphanely speake or use the holy Name of God or Christ Jesus, or of the Holy Ghoste or of the Trintie, which are not to be spoken but with feare and reverence, shall forfeite for everie such Offence by hym or them cōmitted Tenne Pound<sup>c</sup>, the one Moytie thereof to the King<sup>c</sup> Majestie his Heires and Successors, the other Moytie thereof to hym or them that will sue for the same in any Courte of Recorde at Westminster, wherein no Esooigne Proteccon or Wager of Lawe shalbe allowed.

<sup>4</sup> *English Post*, December 13/16.

We the Grand Jury of Middlesex, do present that the Plays which are frequently acted in the Playhouse in Drury lane and Lincoln's Inn Fields in this country are full of prophane, irreverent, Lewd, indecent and immoral expressions, and tend to the great displeasure of Almighty God, and to the corruption of the auditory both in their Principles and Practices. We also present that the common Acting of Plays in the said Playhouse very much tend to the debauching and ruining of the Youth resorting thereto, and to the breach of Peace, and are occasions of many riots, routs, and disorderly assemblies, whereby many murders and other misdemeanours have been frequently done, and particularly the barbarous murder of Sir Andrew Slanning, which was very lately committed as he came out of one of the said Playhouses: and further that the Common acting of Plays at the said Playhouse is a publick Nuisance. As also the Bear Garden at Hockley in the Hole in the Parish of St. John's Clerkenwell in the said County to be of the like Nuisance. We hope this Honourable Court will use the most effectual and speedy means for the suppressing thereof.<sup>1</sup>

The "honourable Court" doubtless did what it could, but there were no further laws or presentations until August 12, 1701, when the Lord Mayor repeated his order for Bartholomew Fair.<sup>2</sup> The Society for the Reformation of Manners still flourished, however, and on September 22 the *Scourge for the Playhouses* was published. In October Charles Povey, in a tract called *The Unhappiness of England as to its trade by Sea and Land*, enumerated eleven principal charges against the Stage; they were: "(1) Blasphemous expressions; (2) Atheistical discourses; (3) Prophane drollery; (4) Despising seriousness; (5) Debasing vertue; (6) Applauding vice; (7) Reflecting on the Clergy; (8) Exclaiming against Marriage; (9) Making a Mock of Infirmities; (10) Scoffing at old Age; (11) Representing the pleasures of debauchery and many other particulars that are too numerous for this little tract."

A more important move was made on November 20, 1701, when information was brought in the King's Bench against 12 of the players, Mrs. Braccgirdle, Mrs. Barry, Mr. Betterton, Mr. Vanbruggen, &c. for

<sup>1</sup> *Post Man*, December 17/19; Luttrell, p. 720. On June 4, 1710, the Grand Jury of the City of London complimented the Society for the Reformation of Manners on its beneficial effect (*Sessions paper*, June 5, 1710) and on July 9, 1710, the *Post Man* announces: "Since the late Presentment by the Grand Jury of Middlesex, of the Constables for negligence in their Dutys in the Suppressing of Vice and Prophaneness some of the Constables of the Cities of London and Westminster have showed their Diligence in taking up Swearers in the Streets and Markets. . . ."

<sup>2</sup> *Flying Post*, August 9/12, 1701.

using indecent expressions in some late plays, particularly the *Provok'd Wife*, and are to be tried the latter end of the term.<sup>1</sup>

Whilst the trial was pending another unpleasant incident occurred, this time at Lincoln's Inn Fields,

some of the Footmen that were waiting, endeavouring to force the House in opposition of the Centinel, were all engaged instantly in a bloody quarrel, whereupon the Centinel firing upon 'em killed one of them on the spot, and several others were wounded in the scuffle.<sup>2</sup>

Naturally, recent trouble of this kind did not prepossess the jury in the trial, who accordingly brought in a verdict of guilty.<sup>3</sup> On the same day, February 16, the actors of Lincoln's Inn were also brought before Lord Justice Holt for using immoral expressions, but were discharged.<sup>4</sup> Anne, who had recently come to the throne, almost immediately issued a Proclamation against impiety and immodesty,<sup>5</sup> and followed this on July 28 with a repetition of the earlier Proclamations against Bartholomew Fair.<sup>6</sup> Apart from these restrictions the most noteworthy events connected with the theatres during the year were the interesting publications<sup>7</sup> and the three duels that were fought, one involving the converted Bowen.<sup>8</sup> Further, Killebrew, the Master of the Revels, attempted to restrict the activities of wandering players.<sup>9</sup> The influence of Anne undoubtedly tended much towards decorum; vice tended to decrease and profanity to be less heard on the stage. On July 1, 1703, she was congratulated by the Grand Jury of the City of London on her effect, and the opportunity was taken of urging her to make good the previous laws against the playhouses and fairs :

But as there is something yet wanting towards the carrying on a New Reformation of Manners, so we think it our duty Humbly to propose the consideration of it to this Honourable Court, viz. The having some

<sup>1</sup> Luttrell, v. 111.

<sup>2</sup> *New State of Europe*, December 27/30, 1701.

<sup>3</sup> *Flying Post*, February 17/19, 1702. For discussion of this trial, see Krutch, *op. cit.* pp. 170 ff.

<sup>4</sup> February 24/26, 1702.

<sup>5</sup> March 28. Brit. Mus. 21. h. 3 (210). That the notices had little effect is proved by *Observer*, June 10/13, 1702.

<sup>6</sup> Brit. Mus. 1851. b. 27.

<sup>7</sup> E.g. *Comparison between the Two Stages* on April 14 (*Flying Post*, April 11/14); *Theatra Vindicata* (Post Boy, May 12/14); *Short Defence of the Comparison* (*Flying Post*, May 16/18).

<sup>8</sup> Post Boy, June 11/13. See *Observer*, June 10/13, 1702. Colonel Fielding and Mr. Goodyear fought at Drury Lane; Captain Fullwood and Mr. Cusaick fought at Lincoln's Inn, see *Flying Post*, December 15/17, 1702.

<sup>9</sup> *Post Man*, September 8/10 and October 1/3, 1702.



effectual course taken if possible, to prevent the youth of this City resorting to the Playhouses, which we rather mention because the Playhouse Bills are again Posted up throught the City, in contempt of a former presentment, and a positive Order of the Lord Mayor and Court of Aldermen to the contrary, as also because we are informed that a Playhouse within the Liberties of the City has been of late disused and neglected, is at this time refitting in order to be used as formerly. We do not presume to prescribe to this Honourable Court, but we cannot question but that if they shall think fit, Humbly to address Her Majesty in this Case she will be graciously pleased to prevent it. We further think ourselves obliged Humbly to propose, that some regulations of Bartholomew Fair may be speedily thought on; whereas we are informed that at least some hundred persons are generally Revelling till late at Night, as Strangers as well inhabitants of this City, at Musick-houses, Drolls, Lotteries &c, to the dishonour of this City, the Corrupting of its Youth and the encouragement of Lewd and Disorderly Persons, quite contrary to the ancient design and first institution of the Fair. An instance of the great mischief that constantly attend such Tumults hath been this Session brought before the Honourable Court, in proof of a Barbarous Murder of a Constable in the Execution of his Office in a Neighbouring Fair.<sup>1</sup>

There was a similar presentment on December 2, whereby suggesting that the earlier one met with little response. Early in 1704, Queen Anne ordered that no play was to be presented unless licensed; she therefore reaffirmed a previous regulation,<sup>2</sup> and this was succeeded by a Special Order to the Master of Revels,

Whereby we have already given Orders to the Master of Our Revels, and also to both the Company of Comedians Acting in Drury Lane and Lincoln's Inn Fields to take special care that nothing be Acted in either of the Theatres contrary to Religion or Good Manners upon Pain of our High Displeasure, and of being silenced from further Acting; And being further desirous to Reform all Indecencies and Abuses of the Stage, which have occasioned great disorders and justly given offence; Our Will and Pleasure therefore is, and We do thereby strictly Command, That No Person of what quality so-ever, presume to go behind the scenes, or come upon the Stage, whether before or during the Acting of any Play: That no Woman be allowed or presume to wear a Vizard-Mask in either of the Theatres; And No Person to come into either House without paying the Prices Established for their respective places all which orders we strictly command all the Managers, Sharers and Actors, of the said Companies, to see exactly observed and obeyed. And We require and Command all our Constables and others, appointed to attend the theatres to be aiding and assisting to them therein; and if any Persons whatsoever

<sup>1</sup> *Post Man*, July 10/13, 1703. Similar Presentments: *Post Man*, November 30/December 2, and *Daily Courant*, December 3, 1703.

<sup>2</sup> Nicoll, *Eighteenth Century Drama* (1700-1750), pp. 281-2.



shall disobey this our known Pleasure and Command, We shall Proceed against them as Contemnners of Our Royal Authority and Disturbers of the Publick Peace. Given at Our Court of St. James's the Seventeenth day of January 1703 in the second year of Our Reign.<sup>1</sup>

About a fortnight later, directions for the Comedians when they acted at Court were issued.<sup>2</sup> On March 9, 1704, the Queen, still receiving notice of the indecent Expressions uttered by "players and mountebanks," ordered Charles Killigrew, the Master of the Revels, to see that all "Drolls, Farces, Interludes, Dialogues, Epilogues and other Entertainments" were presented to him at Somerset-House, "to be by him perused, corrected, and allowed under his hand pursuant to Her Majesty's Commands under pain of being proceeded against for Contempt of Her Majesty's said order."<sup>3</sup> This order was anything but effective, as on April 13, 1704, the Master of Revels complained that "Strolling Players pretending to have Licences from Noblemen, puppet-owners, showers of strange sights" and other mountebanks took no notice of the order. Again he threatened to take action. As there were no more notices of this nature it is presumed that either the players thought it best to concede or that the Office of Revels was innocuous.<sup>4</sup> From this time onwards the difficulties of the stage as far as magistrates and proclamations are concerned tend to grow less. There is a marked absence of royal decrees and actors seemed at last to have learned for the time being how to avoid official wrath. The year 1705 was a quiet one in stage affairs; except for some frivolous articles in the *Observer*<sup>5</sup> and the publication of some lesser pamphlets there is nothing to record: and 1706 was equally barren but for the publication on January 3 of the *Stage Condemned*,<sup>6</sup> the Presentment of the Jury of Bristol,<sup>7</sup> the order of Anne forbidding the rehearsing of any play during Passion-Week,<sup>8</sup> and the publication of Dr. Bedford's Book.<sup>9</sup> On January 13, 1707, Filmer's *Defence*

<sup>1</sup> *London Gazette*, January 17/20, 1704. Decree, of course, is old style.

<sup>2</sup> Nicoll, *Eighteenth Century Drama* (1700-1750), pp. 281-2.

<sup>3</sup> *Daily Courant*, March 9, 1704.

<sup>4</sup> There were two important publications this year, Collier's *Dissuasive, Post Man*, January 4/6; *Representation of the Impiety and Immorality of English Stage*, *Daily Courant*, January 20; on February 8 Mrs. Tofts apologized for conduct of her servant in throwing oranges at the famous Margarita.

<sup>5</sup> *E.g.* January 5 and September 8.

<sup>6</sup> *Post Man*, January 1/3.

<sup>7</sup> *Evening Post*, August 29; see *Observer*, September 4/7.

<sup>8</sup> *L.C.* 5/154 p. 156.

<sup>9</sup> *Observer*, November 13/16, 1706.

of plays was published;<sup>1</sup> and it was followed on February 13 by Collier's *Vindication*.<sup>2</sup> On June 2, 1708, Bartholomew Fair with its booths and shows proved so objectionable that the Grand Juries petitioned for the restriction of the number of days to three instead of fourteen.<sup>3</sup> This was doubtless effected. The next year saw the tightening up of the regulations relating to Mayfair, for on April 28 Anne announced that as the purpose of the fairs had been perverted by booths, plays, etc., these were henceforth forbidden.<sup>4</sup> On September 7, 1709, Drury Lane were forbidden to act owing to their misdemeanour; a week later York banned acting there and turned the playhouse into a woollen manufactory; and the Middlesex Justices also stopped the acting of plays at Hampstead.<sup>5</sup> These were rebuffs which showed clearly the temper of the times. Throughout 1710 the stage experienced a period of outward calm, but it was still looked on with suspicion, and its function was constantly discussed.<sup>6</sup> The Proclamations of Anne had had a chastening effect, but that there was much to be done was evidenced by another Order of November 13, 1711, which stated:

Whereas we are informed that the Orders We have already given for the Reformation of the Stage by not permitting anything to be acted contrary to Religion or Good Manners, have in great measure, had the good effect We purposed, and being further desirous to reform all other Indecencies and disorders of the Stage, Our Will and Pleasure therefore is, and We do hereby Strictly command That no Person of what Quality soever, presume to stand behind the Scenes, or come upon the Stage, either before or during the Acting of any opera or play: And that no Person come into Either of Our Houses for Opera or Comedy without paying first the Established Prices for their respective places. All which Orders We strictly Command the Managers both of Our Operas and Comedy to see exactly observed and obey'd: And if any Persons whatsoever shall disobey Our known pleasure and Command, We shall proceed against them as Contemners of Our Royal Authority and Disturbers of the publick Peace.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *London Gazette*, January 9/13.

<sup>2</sup> *Daily Courant*, February 13, 1708.

<sup>3</sup> *Reasons for the Punctual Limiting of Bartholomew Fair to those three days to which it is determined by the Royal Grant of it to the City of London*, 1711. Guildhall Lib. A.1.1. For account of Bartholomew Fair, see Morley's *Memoirs of Bartholomew Fair*; *Secret Mercury*, September 9, 1702; *Observer*, August 21, 1703; *Post Man*, August 19, 1706; *Heracitus Ridens*, No. 7; *London Post*, August 21, 1701; *London Spy*, Parts 9 and 10; *Post Man*, September 8, 1702.

<sup>4</sup> *Brit. Mus.* 21. h. 4 (64); *London Gazette*, April 28/May 2, 1709.

<sup>5</sup> *Post Boy*, September 13/15, 1709.

<sup>6</sup> See, *inter alia*, *British Apollo*, May 24/26; and *Vision of Sir Heister Ryley*, November 16, 1710.

<sup>7</sup> *London Gazette*, November 13/15, 1711 L.C. 5/155, p. 225.

This Ordinance, coupled with that which determined to treat all unlicensed actors as Vagrants and Vagabonds,<sup>1</sup> declared Anne's unwavering policy of properly controlling the theatres and the actors. And it is significant that Steele, when he urged his claim to the post of manager of Drury Lane, declared that, if appointed, he would do his best to stop the current abuses.<sup>2</sup> With the passing of Anne, however, and the coming of the Georges, the stage breathed a little more freely. The Prince and Princess of Wales both appreciated the theatres and their patronage did much to make it a success.

<sup>1</sup> Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 38607, f. 58-59.

<sup>2</sup> L.C. 7/3.

## NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

### FROISSART'S ACCOUNT OF CHAUCER'S EMBASSY IN 1377

IN reopening after a considerable interval the discussion of the negotiations in which Chaucer was engaged in 1377 for a marriage between Richard, the heir to the English throne, and Princess Marie of France,<sup>1</sup> I would explain that the substance of this communication was sent to the editor of *The Review of English Studies* in the summer of 1935, but that circumstances not subject to my control have prevented its appearance until now.

The date of Marie's death, which Professor Manly called in question in his earlier discussion (*R.E.S.*, x. 267-72), is established by such clear evidence that it needs no further argument. Froissart's own statement in the Soubise MS. of his *Chroniques* (noted also by Manly, *ibid.*, xi. 209-13) that her death occurred shortly after that of Edward III (June 21, 1377) is itself a sufficient commentary on the improbability of the view that she died prior to January 1377. And the payment on May 30, 1377, for her funeral pall may be taken as fixing approximately the date of her death. In fact, I should not regard it as either necessary or profitable to reopen the discussion were it not for the fact that, in striving to exclude the explicit testimony of Froissart in regard to these marriage negotiations, Manly raised general doubts as to Froissart's reliability, thereby creating the impression that his statements are not to be trusted unless they can be confirmed by outside sources. This indictment, it seems to me, does serious injustice to Froissart's authority as an historian.

For his sweeping criticism of Froissart's *Chroniques*, the only evidence which Manly offers is a series of minor discrepancies already noted by Siméon Luce. But in this matter Manly omits to quote Luce's own carefully considered verdict:

... Froissart, quoiqu'il ait embrassé dans sa narration l'histoire de plusieurs pays et qu'il ait donné à son œuvre une étendue tout à fait exceptionnelle, égale néanmoins, s'il ne surpasse, au point de vue de l'exatitute, la plupart des chroniqueurs contemporains (I. cxiii).

<sup>1</sup> See my earlier communication, "The Historical Background of the *Parlement of Fowles*," *R.E.S.*, xi. 204-9.

What is still more important, we have Luce's own statement as to Chaucer's connection with these marriage negotiations :

Chaucer ne figure dans aucune des députations officielles de 1376 et de 1377 ; mais il n'en saurait être autrement, puisque les négociations, auxquelles le malicieux observateur des mœurs anglaises de la fin du quatorzième siècle fut mêlé, devaient rester secrètes et n'ont point laissé sans doute d'autres traces écrites que des articles de comptabilité. Nous apprenons précisément par un de ces articles qu'un paiement fut fait, le 17 février, à Geoffroi Chaucer qu'Édouard III avait chargé d'une mission en Flandre (VIII. cxxxix, n. 3).

Although Froissart sometimes fell into error through depending upon his informants, he used commendable diligence in seeking wherever he had opportunity to verify the details of his narrative. According to Professor Shears, Froissart showed "unparalleled conscientiousness and industry" in gathering his data : during more than fifty years "he spared neither energy nor money in his quest for information." This tribute to Froissart's industry Professor Shears illustrates by a more detailed statement :

Even the knight seeking adventures "near and far" could not have led a more restless existence than the zealous scribe whom we have seen travelling the roads of England, France, Scotland and the Low Countries in quest of matter for his book. When an expedition was planned we find him inspecting and recording the preparations, whether in Bordeaux or in Flanders ; when a treaty was discussed we find him in the antechamber ready to interview the ambassadors ; when a marriage was celebrated he was one of the guests. Wherever he went he was looked upon as the official historian, and every knight who had news to tell was anxious to have it recorded.<sup>1</sup>

Particularly noteworthy is the intimate knowledge which Froissart shows of contemporary events. In discussing the battle of Otterburn, the historian Burton accepts the testimony of the *Chroniques* without qualifications :

Froissart's narrative is the authority for this account of the battle of Otterburn. It shows so accurate a knowledge of persons and places, and gives the sequence of events so distinctly, that by internal evidence it would commend itself to belief as rendered by one who had carefully questioned them and had a peculiar capacity for getting at the truth of such affairs.<sup>2</sup>

Indeed, Froissart's narrative throughout convinces the reader of his fairness and good faith. In an era of patronage, he was

<sup>1</sup> F. S. Shears, *Froissart, Chronicler and Poet*, pp. 93-4.

<sup>2</sup> J. H. Burton, *The History of Scotland*, II. 363, n. 1.

singularly free of marked bias. His independent spirit appears in his open declaration :

Let it not be said that I have corrupted this noble history through the favour accorded me by Count Guy de Blois, for whom I wrote it. No, indeed ! for I will say nothing but the truth and keep a straight course without favouring one side or the other ; moreover, the noble Count, who made me write this history, would not wish me to give anything but the true version of events.<sup>1</sup>

Moreover, he was not a respecter of persons. Few of the leading characters in the *Chroniques* entirely escape criticism—even the Black Prince, Froissart's greatest hero, receives censure for his arrogance—and in dealing with the French and English he is notably impartial. Unlike the author of the *Grandes Chroniques*, who regarded the defeat at Cressy as due to divine interposition, Froissart seeks a purely rational explanation of events ; as Buckle testifies, " He carries us into a new world, the old theological spirit being destroyed." <sup>2</sup>

The episode of the Countess of Salisbury affords an excellent illustration of Froissart's care in checking up evidence. In his notes on this episode as it is introduced in the play *Edward III* (see the Leopold *Shakespeare*), Dr. Furnivall writes :

The story of the Episode is founded on Froissart (l. 98, ed. 1812), and the history of it has some interest, for as my friend Professor Guizot pointed out to me, Froissart (ed. Luce, MS. d'Amiens, III. 293 (Soc. de l'Histoire de France)) first believed in Jean le Bel's story that Edward III had used force and violated the Countess. Then, when he came to England, he inquired right and left as to the truth of the story, and having found it, set it down (p. ci).

Froissart's fame as a writer, which rests on other grounds than authenticity, has unquestionably tended to magnify discrepancies that would have been passed over in a more obscure author. But, as we have seen, the historians are unanimous as to his trustworthiness. Indeed, Siméon Luce declares : " l'opinion contraire est passée pour ainsi dire à l'état de légende " (l. cxxiii).

Concerning the marriage negotiations of 1377, Froissart could easily have secured first-hand information ; for these parleys, it will be remembered, actually took place on French soil, so that he would have had no difficulty in interviewing the French commissioners.<sup>3</sup> Moreover, Froissart was closely acquainted with all three

<sup>1</sup> As translated by Shears, *op. cit.*, p. 103.

<sup>2</sup> H. T. Buckle, *Miscellaneous and Posthumous Works*, I. 234.

<sup>3</sup> Their names appear in Froissart and in *mandement* No. 1425.

of the English commissioners—Chaucer, Sir Richard Stury, and Sir Guichard d'Angle—and his personal friendship with these English members would naturally have increased his own interest in the negotiations.

Finally, Froissart's account is also consistent with our information from other sources. In the *Instructions* sent to his envoys at Boulogne in May 1377, Charles V says :

*Item, le Roy ne veult pas que l'en parle de mariage de par lui, mais, se les Anglois en faisoient mencion, l'en pourroit oir ce que diroient et apres rapporter au Roy* (R. Delachenal, *Chron. des règnes de Jean II et de Charles V*, Soc. de l'Histoire de France, Paris, 1920, III. 207).

The French King's expectation that the marriage proposal would be brought forward makes it evident that he had foreknowledge of the intentions of the English, most likely from some previous discussion of the marriage. Thus interpreted, the situation finds an interesting parallel in the negotiations of February 1430 for a marriage between the young prince Henry VI and the daughter of the King of Scotland. One will observe the almost identical instructions drawn up for the government of the English commissioners on this occasion, as they are explained by Sir Harris Nicolas :

The orders given to them in case the Scots should demand what the ambassadors considered reasonable, prove clearly that the offer of the marriage originated with the King of Scotland, inasmuch as that fact was to be urged as grounds for expecting to find his ambassadors fully prepared to treat upon the point. Whatever offers might be made by the Scots, the English ambassadors were to say that they were insufficient ; and that they could only take them *ad referendum* and report them to the Council (*Proceedings and Ordinances of the Privy Council*, IV. vii).<sup>1</sup>

In initiating the negotiations of 1430 the Scots were in the same position the English had been in the discussion of 1377. It will be remembered that according to the original interpretation the proposals for marriage came from the English side. On the other hand, the rejection of Froissart's testimony as a "confused story" and the assumption that his account is "blended" with the negotiations of 1378<sup>2</sup> involve an obvious chronological contradiction. For these

<sup>1</sup> This effectually disposes of the objection which has been made that the *Instructions* sent by Charles "do not recognize any arrangement for marriage or even any previous discussion of it" (*R.E.S.*, x. 270).

<sup>2</sup> The assumption that the marriage discussion is either "a displacement of the discussion of 1378" or that the "negotiations of 1377 and the peace and marriage negotiations of 1378 were blended" does not accord with the fact that in the redactions Froissart names Marie, not her sister, and that "in all three he asserts that marriage was discussed and that Chaucer was one of the envoys" (*R.E.S.*, XI. 211).



marriage proposals of 1378 took place in June,<sup>1</sup> and Chaucer could not have taken part in these since in May of that year he had departed for Italy (*Life-Records*, No. 121).

The reference to the young princess as "Baby Marie" was evidently intended to belittle the seriousness of the marriage discussion of 1377. But one should remember that in 1396 Richard actually solemnized his marriage with "Baby Isabelle," who like Marie was then a child of seven.<sup>2</sup>

HALDEEN BRADY

### HAMLET'S APOTHEOSIS OF MAN—ITS PUNCTUATION

PROFESSOR DOVER WILSON would change the usual punctuation, and thereby modify the rhythm and meaning, of Hamlet's famous apotheosis of man. This he would do in order to harmonize it with the Quarto 2 text. On the other hand, Professor Peter Alexander has recently argued in these pages that we may safely continue to accept the traditional punctuation, which follows that of the Folio.

I should like to point out that in 1604, the very year in which Quarto 2 was printing, there appeared in the first edition of Marston's *Malcontent* a rhetorical parallel—not to the passage as punctuated in Quarto 2, but as it was later to occur in Folio 1. An ironic apotheosis of woman, the relevant portion reads:

<sup>1</sup> It is true that the payment made to Chaucer on March 6, 1381 (*Life-Records*, No. 143), specifies his services as an envoy in the time of Edward III "versus Mounstreil et Parys", in partibus Francie, causa tractatus pacis pendentis" and also in the time of Richard II "causa locucionis habite de maritagio." To what marriage proposals during Richard's reign could this statement have referred? A royal deputation was appointed on January 16, 1378 (*Fœdera*, IV, 28), but the commissioners appointed were d'Angle, Segrave, and Skirlawe, and there is no record whatsoever that Chaucer was included in this embassy. Now these proposals must have concerned Isabel, inasmuch as in January her younger sister Katherine was yet unborn. Moreover, this discussion must have reached an impasse, for it would necessarily have been interrupted by the death of Isabel on February 23, 1378. The only other proposals in 1378 of which we have knowledge were for a marriage with Katherine, an infant of five months. "The long letter of the papal envoys" (cf. *R.E.S.*, x, 13, n. 3), dated May 7, 1378, to which reference has been made, relates exclusively to a truce and says nothing about marriage (Kervyn's ed., XVIII, 545-57). There is an official memorandum (*ibid.*, XXIII, 350-52) stating that the English and French envoys met separately at Calais and at Boulogne, respectively, and that in joint conference, on June 25, 1378, the French representatives made formal offer of a proposal whereby Katherine should marry Richard—but this was a full month after Chaucer had departed for Italy! It will be noted that the payment to Chaucer was not made until three years later, and it is possible that, in the language of the Issue Roll, the "negotiations of 1377 and the peace and marriage negotiations of 1378 were blended." But no trace of any such confusion appears in Froissart's narrative of these negotiations.

<sup>2</sup> Isabelle of France was born November 9, 1389; she was married to Richard II on November 1, 1396 (Vallet de Viriville, *Bibl. de l'École des Chartes*, XIX, (1857), p. 477).

. . . , in body how delicate, in soule how wittie, in discourse how pregnant, in life how warie, in fauors how iuditious, in day how sociable, and in night how ? . . .

Certainly the rhythm of this is not reminiscent of Quarto 2 :

What peece of worke is a man, how noble in reason, how infinit in faculties, in forme and moouing, how expresse and admirable in action, how like an Angell in apprehension, how like a God :

But it does seem to foreshadow the Folio (the queries to be interpreted as points of exclamation) :

What a piece of worke is a man ! how Noble in reason ? how infinite in faculty ? in forme and mouing how expresse and admirable ? in Action, how like an Angel ? in apprehension, how like a God ?

Though the passage from *The Malcontent* is included in *The Shakespeare-Allusion Book*, it is there compared with the passage from the Folio ; its significant divergence in punctuation and rhythm from the corresponding passage in the Quarto is not remarked.

And now for the inferences which may be drawn from this discrepancy. If Marston is deliberately echoing the rhythm of the Shakespearian passage, he may (1) be indebted to his memory of how Burbage delivered it in the theatre, or (2) have had access to a manuscript which varied in punctuation from the text as printed in 1604. Of these possibilities (and, at the moment, I can think of no other) the first seems the more likely.

As for the hypothesis that it was Shakespeare who was influenced by *The Malcontent* and not Marston who was affected by *Hamlet*, this would now seem to presuppose that : (1) Shakespeare, in attempting to reproduce the rhythm of the Marstonian passage, botched it by careless pointing ; or (2) though Shakespeare faithfully reproduced it, the compositor who set up Quarto 2 failed to follow copy. Either of these contingencies (and they are nothing more) would account for the inadequacy of punctuation which has misled Professor Wilson.

ROBERT J. KANE.

#### THE CHARACTER OF DANIEL DEFOE

THE analysis of Defoe's civet-cat venture by Mr. Theodore F. M. Newton<sup>1</sup> is of very real value to the student of literary history. An allusion to Defoe's career which seemed to be beyond conjecture

<sup>1</sup> "The Civet-Cats of Newington Green : New Light on Defoe," *The Review of English Studies*, January 1937.

has been convincingly explained, and we are reminded yet again that references which are unintelligible to modern students may have been perfectly clear to an author's contemporaries.

Mr. Newton's added conclusions in regard to Defoe's character are less convincing. It is one of the perils of discoveries in legal records that the investigator is apt to reconstruct the whole from the part, and that part too often—as in these documents—written by people who had a partisan bias. No judge to-day would fail to instruct the jury to dismiss this case against Defoe for lack of sufficient evidence; and although the rules of historical evidence allow a much wider discretion to the scholar than the law allows to a jury, it is obvious that the case should not be decided against Defoe merely because the allegations of his opponents are preserved for us and his defence must be pieced together from scattered facts.

Mr. Newton calls Defoe a "gay deceiver." A bankrupt fugitive, unable to answer the court summons in his own behalf and endeavouring to compound with his creditors to assure his freedom from a debtor's prison, he was certainly not "gay." Is there any adequate proof that he was a "deceiver"?

Two strong probabilities confront us at once when we examine the declarations as summarized by Mr. Newton:

(1) The suit of Defoe's mother-in-law, Joan Tuffley, was, as far as it concerned Defoe, a "friendly suit," begun during his enforced absence from London with no expectation of getting anything from him, but with a very apparent intention of securing testimony which would force Sir Thomas Estcourt and others to disgorge; and the replies of Estcourt, Barksdale, and the others were made in their own defence.

(2) The only real losers by the transaction were Defoe and his mother-in-law, who lost Defoe's down payment of £200, his notes for £300, and nearly £600 of Joan Tuffley's money. Estcourt, "a reputable and wealthy merchant," became even wealthier (although perhaps less reputable) through this transaction, profiting at every stage down to the final forfeiture of the widow Tuffley's seven nobles when she failed to win her suit against him. Barksdale got a large down payment from Defoe, and yet he was able to turn the entire property over to Estcourt in payment of his own debts. Stancliffe had his loan of £400 repaid to him. Sheriffs Lane and Cooke (or their deputies) lost nothing by their management of the sale. To say the least, Estcourt and Barksdale were very fortunate

and Defoe and his mother-in-law very unfortunate in the matter of the civet-cats.

So far from practising "chicanery," Defoe seems to have been careless if not actually gullible in his legal transactions. One of his sons defrauded him in his attempt to convey his property for the benefit of his family.<sup>1</sup> As Prof. James R. Sutherland has pointed out,<sup>2</sup> the widow Brooke—an executrix and perhaps a relative of the Stancliffes—was enabled by a legal oversight on Defoe's part to worry him out of his own home in his last days and to seize on his remaining property. When we find Defoe involved in criminal cases, he is attempting to defend himself from jail or pillory for speaking his mind; when we find him involved in civil cases, he is attempting to secure relief through the Court of Chancery. Journalist, merchant, projector, statesman, economist, and so many other things besides, Defoe was no lawyer. The wry distaste for courts of law which appears in many of his writings was not without justification in his own experience.

I have remarked that allusions which are obscure to us were often perfectly intelligible to the author's contemporaries. To a large degree the same sort of thing is true of judgments of character. Biographers have followed their own fancies in making Defoe out a Protestant hero, a liar and rogue, or a well-intentioned man whose moral fibre was broken by persecution and misfortune. His contemporaries of the 1690's had no such opinion of him. Even in the political controversies of the age of Anne, when invective was substituted for argument, the available facts do not place him in any such convenient category. The political historians of the period—Trevelyan, Laprade, Morgan, and the rest—have recognized this; but literary historians have continued to put the worst (or best) interpretations on Defoe's acts, and to judge journalistic writing as if it were abstract philosophy or idealistic poetry.

It has been hastily assumed from Samuel Tuffley's will that Defoe was on bad terms with his brother-in-law; but the conditions of Tuffley's will are explicitly drawn to keep his legacy to Defoe's wife from being enmeshed in the various claims which continued to reappear to swallow up Defoe's own property. Tuffley made no reflection on Defoe's integrity; in the same document he indicated his regard for Defoe; he had previously been engaged in a bloody

<sup>1</sup> G. A. Aitken, "Defoe's Wife," *The Contemporary Review*, February 1890.

<sup>2</sup> "A Note on the Last Years of Defoe," *Modern Language Review*, April 1934.

encounter as Defoe's friend, and he is thought to have made room for Defoe's family under his own roof—but he did not wish to have his bequest wiped out by the technicalities of the bankruptcy laws of that day. Like many a prudent man of our own time, he kept the property entirely in the name of the wife. And his foresight was justified by the event; Mary Defoe retained her legacy when Defoe was driven out of his home. It is clear that Joan Tuffley remained on good terms with Defoe; her daughter was at that very time engaged in compounding his debts and at one period after the widow's remarriage the Defoe family lived in her home. It is clear that Defoe's reputation with the business world and with the Government was unimpaired, perhaps even advanced; Parliament considered him favourably as a debtor who merited relief because his difficulties were due to the war; merchants invited him to settle at Cadiz as a factor with large commissions; and the Government employed him as a commissioner of the glass duty and as manager trustee of the royal lottery. (These public offices required that he be trusted by the populace as well as by the Government.) William III, that shrewd and cynical judge of men who distrusted Marlborough until necessity forced his choice, had no misgivings about the integrity of Defoe; and Defoe's worst enemies, although they called him civet-cat merchant, did not usually add any suggestion that he was a thief.

To one who has lived with Defoe long enough to fancy that he has some understanding of his character, it gives a grim satisfaction to find that in 1697, when Defoe was still commissioner of the glass duty, the "reputable and wealthy" Sir Thomas Estcourt (who had profited by Defoe's distress) was taken into custody by the House of Commons<sup>1</sup>; and in 1695, when Defoe was high in public trust as commissioner of the glass duty and as manager trustee for a £50,000 royal lottery, "the wealthy Sir Thomas Cooke,"<sup>2</sup> one of the sheriffs who had seized the civet-cats for a forced sale, was imprisoned in the Tower for his part in the colossal bribery in favour of the new charter for the Old East India Company.<sup>3</sup>

JOHN ROBERT MOORE.

<sup>1</sup> Luttrell's *Brief Relation*, December 16, 1697.

<sup>2</sup> In Defoe's satiric writings, Sir Thomas Cooke's name became a synonym for the "season'd Drunkard," as I shall point out in a forthcoming study, "Defoe in the Pillory: A New Interpretation."

<sup>3</sup> Luttrell's *Brief Relation*, August 31, 1695, *et seq.*

## THE PARENTAGE OF EDMUND ("RAG") SMITH

THE first account of the life of Edmund ("Rag") Smith, poet and dramatist, remembered chiefly for his classicized heroic tragedy, *Phædra and Hippolitus*,<sup>1</sup> was written by his friend and fellow student at Oxford, William Oldisworth. The critical reception accorded this *Life*, prefixed to the *Works of Mr. Edmund Smith* (1714), is indicated by Johnson's pronouncement that Oldisworth's account,

written while his admiration was yet fresh, and his kindness warm, . . . without any criminal purpose of deceiving, shows a strong desire to make the most of all favourable truth. I cannot much commend the performance. The praise is often indistinct, and the sentences are loaded with words of more pomp than use. There is little, however, that can be contradicted, even when a plainer tale comes to be told.<sup>2</sup>

Subsequent biographers<sup>3</sup> have followed Johnson's lead, minimizing the importance of Oldisworth's extravagant praise of his friend, but accepting as final truths the facts of Smith's life as Oldisworth presents them. Upon some of these facts, however, reasonable doubt is cast by an examination of the will<sup>4</sup> of Sir Nicholas Lechmere (1613-1701).<sup>5</sup>

Oldisworth gives no dates either for the birth or death of Smith. However, George Duckett, in a letter to William Oldmixon, states that Smith came down to visit him at his home at Hartham, in Wiltshire, "about June, 1710, where he continu'd till he died, about six Weeks after."<sup>6</sup> Moreover, Smith being buried in the parish church at Hartham, one finds in his epitaph the inscription: "Obiit

<sup>1</sup> First performance noted by Genest, *Some Account of the English Stage*, Bath, 1832, II. 368: "Haymarket, April 21, 1707." The play was several times revived. For performances in 1723, 1726, 1745, 1751, 1754, 1774, 1775, 1780, and 1785, see Genest, *op. cit.*, X. xcvi., and Allardyce Nicoll, *History of Early Eighteenth Century Drama*, Cambridge, 1925, p. 355.

<sup>2</sup> Samuel Johnson, *Lives of the Most Eminent English Poets*, edited by Peter Cunningham, London, 1854, II. 49.

<sup>3</sup> Samuel Johnson, *op. cit.*, II. 41-59; Robert Anderson, *Works of the British Poets*, Edinburgh, 1793, VI. 585-588; Samuel Austin Allibone, *A Critical Dictionary of English Literature*, Philadelphia, 1872, II. 2, 133; Sidney Lee, "Edmund Smith," *D.N.B.*, 1898, vol. 53, pp. 30-31.

<sup>4</sup> The will of Sir Nicholas Lechmere of Hanley Castle, Worcestershire, proved by Edmund Lechmere on June 27, 1701. *P.C.C. Dyer* 82 at Somerset House.

<sup>5</sup> On Lechmere, cf. *D.N.B.*, vol. 32, p. 335.

<sup>6</sup> William Oldmixon, *The History of England during the Reigns of the Royal House of Stuart*, London, 1730, IX. Oldmixon prints Duckett's letter in the Preface to his history in support of his charge that Clarendon's *History of the Rebellion* had been garbled.



A.D. MDCCX. Aetat. 42."<sup>1</sup> This places his birth in the year 1668, which is the nearest we can come to the facts of the case in the absence of an entry in the parish register.

Oldisworth states that Smith was "the only son of an eminent merchant, one Mr. Neale, by a daughter of the late Baron Lechmere."<sup>2</sup> Johnson, Allibone, and, later, Sidney Lee repeat this statement. Johnson further states, and Lee follows him, without evidence in either case, that Smith was born at Hanley Castle, the seat of the Lechmeres, in Worcestershire, or at nearby Tenbury. Oldisworth continues, that "some misfortunes of his father, which were soon after followed by his death, were the occasion of the son's being left very young in the hands of a near relation . . . whose name was Smith." Lee accepts this statement, but while Oldisworth declares this Smith to be the husband of Neale's sister, Lee suggests that he was "doubtless Matthew Smith of London, who married Margaret, Sir Nicholas Lechmere's sister." Whatever the relationship, however, Smith and his wife raised the young Edmund Neale, sending him to Westminster and later to Christ Church, Oxford, where, according to Oldisworth, he was "by his aunt handsomely maintained till her death." Allibone states that an actual adoption took place, but Oldisworth says simply that "this gentleman and lady treated him (young Neale) as their own child," the poet assuming and retaining the name of "his faithful and generous guardian."

It is difficult to understand how Lee, in his life of Smith written for the *D.N.B.*, could have overlooked the obvious gaps in Oldisworth's story. Even Oldisworth himself, anxious though he was to present only the more pleasing aspects of his subject, was obliged by the force of contemporary rumour to admit the existence of some doubt in the matter of Smith's parentage. He writes :

Some time before his (Smith's) leaving Christchurch he was sent for by his mother to Worcester, and owned and acknowledged as her legitimate son ; which had not been mentioned but to wipe off the aspersions that were ignorantly cast by some on his birth.

That the daughter of Baron Lechmere, from her residence at her family's seat in Worcestershire, should feel obliged to stoop to any

<sup>1</sup> Anderson, *op. cit.*, vi. 587. "Epitaph from his friend Mr. Adams of Christ Church."

<sup>2</sup> William Oldisworth, "A Character of the Author," quoted entire by Johnson, *op. cit.*



such formal "acknowledgment" of her son indicates that the questioning of the poet's parentage must have been of considerable strength and persistence.

In addition to Oldisworth's admission, however, there remains the more significant evidence offered by E. P. Shirley in *Hanley and the House of Lechmere*.<sup>1</sup> Lee includes this work in his bibliography, but omits in the body of his life any mention of the facts disclosed by Shirley. These facts are vital, however, in any discussion of Smith's life, inasmuch as they call into question the veracity of Oldisworth's account, now generally accepted as the authoritative version of Smith's parentage.

Shirley includes in his work an abstract from the Journal of "the celebrated Judge, Sir Nicholas Lechmere" in which there occurs the following note: "January 12. 1670. My daughter Margaret was married to Edmund Neal of London Esq." In a footnote Shirley writes as follows:

The P(arish) R(egister) of Hanley says, Jan. 10, 1670. Edmund Smith, one of the minor poets of England, is said to have been the son of this Edmund Neale and Margaret Lechmere, and to have been born near Tenbury in 1668, and to have adopted the name of *Smith* from the kindness of a relation. If born 1668, he was probably the son of Matthew Smith and Margaret Lechmere, the Judge's sister.

By virtue of the fact that Lee omits any mention of Shirley's suggestion in his account, one may safely assume that Lee discards Shirley's supposition and prefers to follow Oldisworth on this point. The date of the poet's birth he advances to the year 1672, neglecting to mention, however, on what basis he chooses to ignore the evidence to the contrary offered by Smith's epitaph.

Despite the fact that Lee chooses to ignore the possibility, however, it is entirely within the compass of known facts that the poet may have been the son of Margaret Lechmere Smith. Her brother, Judge Lechmere, writing in his Journal, says: "My father Edmund Lechmere dyed y<sup>e</sup> last of July. 1650. . . . He left behind him . . . two sons . . . and six daughters, Anne, . . . Mary, . . . Margaret wife to M<sup>r</sup> Mathew Smith of London. . . ." Margaret's place in the sequence of names seems to indicate that she was the youngest of the daughters. Nicholas, the first son and heir, was born in 1613, when his father was twenty-seven

<sup>1</sup> Evelyn Philip Shirley, *Hanley and the House of Lechmere*, London, 1883.

years of age.<sup>1</sup> It seems improbable that all six of the daughters should have been born before their father's twenty-seventh year, but even if that extreme possibility were true in fact, Margaret would still have been, in 1668, approximately forty-five years of age, and might possibly have become the mother of the poet at that time. In all probability, however, she was born later than 1613, and was therefore much less than forty-five when the poet was born.

It is the will of Sir Nicholas Lechmere, however, that most seriously calls into question Oldisworth's biography. A codicil to this will, dated October 6, 1697, states, that as his daughter Margaret had a marriage portion of £1,500 when she married Edmund Neale,

a person of noe visible estate but as hath since appeared of many most reprobable ill Conditions and who above twenty yeares since withdrew himself to places unknowne leaving his wife and daughter destitute of necessarys and who unless supported by me must have perished for want the said Edmund Neale in all that long tract of time not affording them one penny towards there subsistence ;

the testator therefore appointed his "very worthy kinsman William Bromley Esq.," his son-in-law Richard Barney, and Mr. Francis Brompton as trustees to see that his daughter Margaret Neale received the sum of £500 due to him from the Exchequer as his salary for two terms, Easter and Trinity last, the interest only to be paid her "soe as her said Husband have noe intermeddling therewith." If the said Edmund Neale died before she did, she was to have the capital. The codicil further states that Margaret's daughter died in October, 1690.

Sir Nicholas's will establishes certain facts, pertaining to Smith, beyond the question of a doubt. In the first place, it establishes once and for all the character of Edmund Neale, the elder. Oldisworth presents this gentleman as "one Mr. Neale, an eminent merchant," who, while his son was still quite young, suffered "some misfortunes, which were soon after followed by his death." Sir Nicholas, however, has a very different story to tell concerning Neale, and, inasmuch as Sir Nicholas had, for "upwards of twenty yeares," supported his daughter after her desertion by Neale, he

<sup>1</sup> Russell Treadway Nash, *Collections for the History of Worcestershire*, London, 1781-1782, I. 560. Tracing the lineage of the Lechmere family, Nash gives the dates of this Edmund as 1586-1650.

appears to have been in a position to speak with authority on the subject of Neale's character as a husband and father. Margaret Lechmere took to Edmund Neale a marriage portion of £1,500, yet within less than seven years Neale left his wife and daughter penniless. No further word, apparently, was ever heard of him. Yet, as far as Sir Nicholas knew, Neale was presumably still alive in 1697 and capable of returning to Hanley Castle to annoy his wife. In bequeathing his daughter the interest of £500, Sir Nicholas took precautions that her inheritance should not tempt back the errant Neale. Sir Nicholas, at least, was convinced of the rascality and general worthlessness of Neale.

A second item of importance may be drawn from this will. While Sir Nicholas says that Margaret Neale was left with a daughter, he fails to mention in any way the existence of a son. Yet surely, had Margaret been left with two children, her plight would have been the more pitiful, and her father, enumerating the sins of his son-in-law, would not have failed to mention this additional damning circumstance, even granting that Margaret Lechmere Smith may already have adopted the young Edmund. Where one grandchild, and a granddaughter at that, is mentioned and even the date of her death is noted in the will, it would have been strange indeed, if not incomprehensible, for Sir Nicholas to have passed over completely the existence of a grandson by that same union. One is almost forced to conclude that some serious irregularity attended the birth of the poet.

That Neale was the father of the poet appears to be likely. Certainly, under the circumstances of his disgraceful behaviour within the Lechmere family circle, his is not the name that would have been arbitrarily chosen for a child born within that circle. Yet every extant reference to the poet gives as his patronymic the name of Neale.

One is necessarily forced into hypothesis. As has already been indicated, it would have been possible for Margaret Lechmere Smith to have been the poet's mother, as the result of a *liaison* with Neale, although here one must take for granted an unusual degree of benevolence on the part of Matthew Smith and an astonishing disregard for the proprieties on the part of the younger Margaret Lechmere, who married Neale two years after the birth of the poet. A second possibility is that the poet may have been the son of Neale and an unknown mother, although this would leave unexplained

his adoption by Margaret Smith and her husband. Moreover, it is practically impossible to believe that under these circumstances the younger Margaret would have married Neale two years later and even gone so far as publicly to acknowledge the poet as her own son thirty-five years later.

There is a third possibility. Speaking of Smith's attitude toward his impecunious existence, Oldisworth makes a statement that seems to argue rather strongly for the poet's blood relationship to the Lechmeres: "He (Smith) knew very well what was due to his birth, though Fortune threw him short of it in every circumstance of life." Under the circumstances of the elder Neale's desertion, Smith's pride in his birth can have no reference to his father. His attitude points unmistakably to a definite knowledge on his part of his connection with the aristocratic Lechmere family. It indicates, besides, a certain resentment of the treatment he had received at the hands of that group. Smith appears to have thought that his birth at Hanley Castle entitled him to a life of gentlemanly leisure. The Baron obviously thought differently on the subject.

On the basis of the evidence here offered, it seems safest to believe that the poet was the son of Edmund Neale and Margaret Lechmere the younger, born illegitimately in 1668 and formally legitimized by the marriage of his parents in 1670. Such a marriage, if forced on Neale, might well explain his subsequent desertion of his wife and family. It might also explain the poet's having been given over as a child to the elder Margaret and her husband and his having been raised by them, although during all this time the younger Margaret and her daughter lived with Sir Nicholas on the family estate and were supported by him. Once having settled at law the betrayal of his daughter, Sir Nicholas seems to have been adamant in his refusal to have anything to do with the illegitimate child of Margaret and Neale, although he was willing to provide for the legitimate child of that same union, and did provide for her and for his daughter in his will as during his lifetime. Even to the last, however, he continued to ignore the fact of his grandson's existence.

Finally, under these circumstances, Margaret Neale's belated public acknowledgment of the poet as her son becomes fully understandable. Oldisworth notes that this acknowledgment was made shortly before the poet left the university.<sup>1</sup> At this date more than thirty-five years stood between Margaret Neale and the possibly

<sup>1</sup> December 20, 1705. MS. Tanner 314, f. 205, in the Bodleian.

scandalous episode of the poet's birth. Her father had died in 1701. Possibly the probate of his will had stirred up anew the old scandal. In any case, the fact remains that at this time Margaret Neale felt called upon to make a public declaration that the poet was her "legitimate son." "Legitimized" would probably have been more accurate.

ELIZABETH M. GEFFEN.

#### THE SITE OF DIODATI'S HOUSE

DIODATI's house had attracted the attention of a Genevese scholar, M. E. Doumergue, before Professor W. S. Clark's and Miss England's articles were published; <sup>1</sup> in his book *La Genève des Genevois*, 1914, pp. 112-5, he states that it was in a street formerly called the Rue de la Boulangerie and now forming part of the Grandrue (the present Rue de la Boulangerie is elsewhere); the site forming part of that of the house numbered 25. Doumergue's book is not at present available in the British Museum or the Bodleian.

E. S. DE BEER.

<sup>1</sup> *R.E.S.*, January 1935, January 1937.

## CORRESPONDENCE

### THE PLAY OF ANTICHRIST FROM THE CHESTER CYCLE

TO THE EDITOR OF *R.E.S.*

DEAR SIR,—

Owing, I understand, to a proof being lost in the post, some remarks which I intended to make upon Professor Salter's review of my edition of *Antichrist* in the July (1937) number of *R.E.S.* failed to get into print. I am very grateful to the reviewer for the minute attention which he bestowed upon my work, and since my remarks were in part directed to acknowledging the accuracy of his criticisms, I should feel obliged if you would kindly allow me to repeat them here.

P. 341, l. 9. H is stated to be P's "nearest relative." But P, being independently derived from the archetype, cannot be more nearly related to one than another of the cyclic manuscripts. I merely said that H was "the manuscript it most closely resembles."

l. 24. To speak of "the normalized spelling of the edition" seems a little misleading, seeing that the only point normalized was the use of *u* and *v* and of *i* and *j*.

On p. 342 is printed a list of twenty readings in which Professor Salter's collations differ from mine, and which are far indeed from all being errors on his part—

56 s.d. My collation is correct: P does not omit, only transposes; I see no reason in W to read *dameles* instead of *danieles* merely because the *i* is not dotted.

107 no B. I read *in* (?) which seems nearer to the obscure original.

120 s.d. *me* PRW: *me* is the reading of RW, as I recorded; P reads *mee* = *meē* = *meae* like D.

208 (?) *demise* B: more likely, I think, *deuise*; in any case, since the reading is certainly doubtful, why assume a variant?

641. It is uncertain whether B reads *shall* or *shalt*.

In all the other instances Professor Salter's collation is correct: I congratulate him on his accuracy.

P. 342, foot. I came to grief badly over *greete* !

P. 346, l. 23. Of two genuine variational groups (comprising between them all the manuscripts) one or other must be genetic.

On p. 348 Professor Salter gives a list of some eight mistakes which a " cursory examination reveals " in my manipulation of variants—

169. The reference in the Classified List should have been given as 167 instead of 169.

260. The reference on p. xxxi should be 263, not 260.

663. My handling here appears to be perfectly correct.

349. The resolution of the factor  $(*\Sigma : WRH)$  was unfortunately omitted from the anomalous list : on p. xxxvi add  $*349 = (*H : \Sigma) . (*WR : \Sigma)$ , and add these factors in their places in the Classified List.

609 and 421. I chose in each case the form of the reading which made a group, and which consequently *might* be significant.

As regards 613, 682, and 611 I can only acknowledge the error.

I remain, Sir, faithfully yours,

W. W. GREG.



## REVIEWS

**The Arte of English Poesie.** By GEORGE PUTTENHAM. Edited by GLADYS DOIDGE WILLCOCK and ALICE WALKER. Cambridge: at the University Press. 1936. Pp. cxii+359. 21s. net.

ENGLISH scholars of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries were well aware of the value of *The Arte of English Poesie* as an aid to the study of the Elizabethan poetical miscellanies and had some sense of its importance in the history of English criticism. Gilchrist was no doubt expressing their opinion when he wrote of the *Arte*, in *Censuria Literaria*, as "intrinsically, one of the most valuable books of the age of Elizabeth." During the last half-century, however, the inherent merits of the *Arte* and the fascinating individuality of its author have been too often lost sight of; and it is the concern of the editors of this new edition that justice should once more be done to them. More copious annotation having, unfortunately, proved impracticable, they devote their comprehensive and vigorously written introduction to the task of illustration and rehabilitation; in the most interesting way they demonstrate the richness and variety of material contained in the *Arte* and vindicate its author as "one of the most alert and flexible Elizabethan minds." Their work reveals an undisguised though by no means uncritical sympathy with the point of view of the writer of the *Arte* and considerable insight into his character; these qualities, in conjunction with their detailed scholarship, both literary and linguistic, and their ingenuity in argument, enable them to write about the *Arte* and its author with a completeness of understanding unattainable by earlier editors. Theirs will undoubtedly remain the standard edition for many years.

The *Arte* appeared anonymously in 1589 and has generally been attributed to either George or Richard Puttenham, nephews of Sir Thomas Elyot, on the grounds (a) that in 1591 Sir John Harington referred to it as "Putnams book" and (b) that early in the seventeenth

century Edmund Bolton wrote of it in *Hypercritica* as "the work as the fame is" of one of Elizabeth's Gentlemen Pensioners, "Puttenham." Some years ago doubts were cast on the traditional ascription by Captain B. M. Ward,<sup>1</sup> who, basing his arguments mainly on the autobiographical passages in the *Arte*, contended that Lord Lumley was a more likely author. Miss Willcock and Miss Walker, however, show that Captain Ward's conclusions are far from certain on the evidence he cites and that weighty reasons exist which render the case for Lumley quite untenable. This leaves them free to reconsider the claims of the Puttenhams. They conclude that there is little to be said in favour of authorship by Richard; for, although the outward events of his life present no serious difficulties, there is no indication that he had any literary interests. The biographical evidence in favour of George, much of which they print for the first time, is by itself inconclusive; but his claim to the authorship does not rest on that alone. The writer of the *Arte* quotes frequently from *Partheniades*, a collection of poems which he wrote in honour of Elizabeth. Comparison of these poems and the *Arte* enables the editors to establish the main characteristics of the author's style and vocabulary, his mental habits, and his convictions about life, religion, and politics. They claim further, and substantiate their claim by an exhaustive analysis, that the same qualities of mind and character and similar views and modes of expressing them are to be found in George Puttenham's *A Justification of Queene Elizabeth*, a prose work written in defence of Elizabeth's conduct towards Mary Queen of Scots. Hence they infer that Puttenham also wrote the *Arte* and *Partheniades*. The case, as they present it, is very strong indeed and in default of definite documentary proof will be generally accepted as the best that can be made out for Puttenham's authorship of the *Arte*.

Arber in 1869 conjectured that the *Arte* was written about 1585 and partially revised before it was printed; and his suggestion has been generally accepted. More than one scholar, however, had previously suspected that in its original form the *Arte* was the first of the Elizabethan critical treatises. Gilchrist, indeed, was prepared to believe that it was already partly written in 1553, when Wilson's *Arte of Rhetorique* was published. Miss Willcock and Miss Walker, though perhaps unwilling to push the date of composition quite so far back, supply ample proof that the plan of the work, as well as

<sup>1</sup> *R.E.S.*, vol. 1 (1925), pp. 284-308.

considerable portions of the text, which they indicate, date from the fifteen-sixties and that Puttenham's earliest draft preceded by several years Gascoigne's *Certayne Notes of Instruction*. At the same time they show that the *Arte* was revised, added to, and brought up to date at various times before publication and, in particular, that large sections of it date from about 1584. These discoveries add enormously to its importance for the literary historian, for the various strata of text and the relations between them yield valuable data regarding the changes in linguistic, prosodic, and critical apprehension that occurred during the thirty years immediately before Shakespeare began to write.

Thus it was perhaps no mere coincidence that the *Arte* should have been dedicated to that outstanding figure of the mid-Tudor age, Lord Burghley. For Puttenham belonged not to the generation of Sidney and Spenser, as many have thought, but to that of the younger contributors to Tottell's *Songes and Sonettes*; some of the latter, who belonged, like himself, to the Inns of Court, Puttenham may have known; he certainly goes to *Songes and Sonettes* for quotations and examples more often than to any other book. When he began to write he intended the *Arte* to be a guide to the theory and practice of verse-making as understood by his mid-Tudor contemporaries, whose ears were attuned to the rhymes and metres of the *Songes and Sonettes* and the mid-century Interludes; and his approach to his subject, equally with his matter and style, proclaims him of the period of Cheke, Wilson, and Ascham. As such a work had never before been attempted in English, he devoted the first of his three books to a discussion of the progress of poetry and its kinds. The first thirty chapters of this book have undergone little or no revision; they are, too, the least original portion of the *Arte*, yet they set the key for the whole work by their highly personal approach to the problems arising out of the existence together of life and poetry. For, unlike most sixteenth-century critics, Puttenham was interested in these problems primarily as a man of the world, not as a scholar or moralist; and the *Arte* derives much of its value and interest as criticism from the predominance of the "romantic" and empirical elements in his personality.

Miss Willcock and Miss Walker are the first to have studied realistically Puttenham's second book, which is concerned with prosody; and their discussion is a work of outstanding importance in the difficult field of early- and mid-Tudor prosody. They point

out that the first eleven chapters formed part of Puttenham's original work, the remainder being an addition of the fifteen-eighties. As an intelligent contemporary's account of the prosody familiar to the poets and readers of the *Songes and Sonettes* period and as first-hand evidence of how its earliest readers read Tottell's collection, these eleven chapters have a unique value for the student. The main point that emerges from them is the failure of the mid-century poets and their readers "to recognize any internal modulation within the line." It was this failure more than anything else that led them to prefer strong masculine rhyme and a heavy fixed cæsura and dictated "the reliance on pause and rhyme" that characterized their reading of verse. In the light of the interpretation now put forward most discussions of early- and mid-Tudor versification would seem to have been beside the point, since those who wrote them have generally assumed that the poets of that period consciously adjusted word- or sentence-stress to the requirements of the metre; Puttenham, however, shows clearly enough that neither they nor their readers recognized the stress-principle. Puttenham's later chapters on prosody, in the second half of this book, are shown to be scarcely less valuable. When he wrote them he was able to draw upon the work of Gascoigne and his followers, of those who advocated the application of classical rules to English prosody, and of the Sidney-Spenser group—all of whom, in different ways, had concentrated on the internal structure of the line. The advances they had made and Puttenham's persistence in the effort to understand enabled him not only to recognize stress but to come very near enunciating it as a governing factor in English verse.

Puttenham's third book, "Of Ornament," was written out of the fullness of his experience and enthusiasm and reflects best of all his many-sided interest in life and letters; it is chiefly concerned with Poetical and Rhetorical Figures. In spite of his unpedantic handling of them, the Figures are probably the most forbidding of all his "divisions" for a modern reader; yet no serious student can afford to neglect what he has to say, for none of his contemporaries has left a livelier account of the Elizabethan conception of style and from none of them can a better idea be gained of the central place occupied by the study and application of the Figures in the literature and education of the generation that preceded Shakespeare. In this section of his work Puttenham's indebtedness to earlier humanists and grammarians was considerable,

but his method of treating the material he borrowed was entirely his own. His originality can be seen to better advantage when he is dealing with the history and growth of the language, standard speech, the admission or rejection of new words, and the efforts of his contemporaries to make English a vehicle of literary expression that might bear comparison with Latin and Greek ; for here his matter was the product of careful observation and thought extending over the whole period during which he was writing. The whole of the *Arte* is marked by a living interest and delight in language, a persistent curiosity about words, and an enthusiastic devotion to the vernacular. Puttenham's good sense, his insight into the genius of the language, and the thorough understanding he had gained of the forces that were moulding it into new forms, together with his open-minded reading of the classics, saved him from the mistaken judgments on current controversies into which many contemporary critics and grammarians were betrayed. Thus not only the variety of linguistic problems he discusses but also the soundness of his judgments on them make his book of particular value to the student of early modern English. In their brilliant essay on this aspect of his work the editors have succeeded most impressively in their twofold aim of exhibiting the quality of Puttenham's mind and the permanent value of his ideas.

In a careful bibliographical note the existence of the text in three principal forms is indicated. At three points revision was made in the text while the work was printing, and the three existing forms are due to definite combinations of these variants ; others may exist. These revisions are important as clues to the dating of various sections of the book. The variant passages are printed in an Appendix. The text has been set up from Ben Jonson's copy, now in the British Museum, of which a full bibliographical description is supplied ; but a word-for-word collation has not been attempted. The general intention of the editors has been to present a text containing as little editorial interference as possible. Thus the punctuation of the original has been kept and in the text " only obvious compositors' errors have been rectified." All these corrections are listed in an Appendix.

The difficult question of Puttenham's sources, printed and manuscript, is dealt with in a third Appendix. The editors have identified an astonishing number of his quotations from English and Latin authors.

Particular care has been expended, largely by the centralization of leading topics, with a view to making the general index as complete and useful a guide to the contents of the *Arte* as possible. There is a further index of the first lines of all English verse-passages quoted in the *Arte*, with cross-references to Appendix III to aid the reader in finding their sources.

H. J. BYROM.

**Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus* : the first quarto, 1594.**

Reproduced in facsimile from the unique copy in the Folger Shakespeare Library with an introduction by JOSEPH QUINCY ADAMS. For the Trustees of Amherst College, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York and London. 1936. Pp. 44+78 collotypes.

THE curious history of the 1594 edition of *Titus Andronicus*, the earliest print of any Shakespearian play, may give us hope that even now new texts may still come to light. Though an edition of 1594 had been mentioned by Langbaine in his *Account of the English Dramatick Poets* (1691), for more than two centuries no copy of the book was known, and it had come to be thought that Langbaine's date must be an error. In January 1905, however, the discovery of a copy of the book in Sweden was announced, and a fortnight later this was sold to the American collector Henry Clay Folger. A description of the edition with a list of those readings in which it differed from the edition of 1600 was printed in the *Jahrbuch* of the German Shakespeare Society for 1905, and this was fortunate, for another quarter of a century passed before the book itself became accessible to students. All the more precious of Folger's books were packed away in strong-rooms until such time as they could be placed in the library which he had planned to present to the American nation, and it was not until the opening of the Folger Shakespeare Library in 1932, two years after its founder's death, that it became possible for the *Titus* to be examined. The trustees of Amherst College, the administrators of the library, have therefore earned the thanks of all students by the issue of this collotype facsimile. It appears to be an excellent reproduction and there is only one thing to regret, namely that the act, scene, and line numbers of a standard edition, such as the "Globe," were not added at the foot of the pages. The tracking of passages in facsimiles which are unprovided



with any means of reference is such an irritating and time-wasting business that, save when their use is quite essential, I fear that most students tend to leave them on their shelves! And in this case we cannot use the Griggs-Praetorius facsimiles as an intermediary, as we can with the Huntington facsimile of *Hamlet* Q1 and Dr. Pollard's of *Richard II* Q3 (comparing the Praetorius facsimile of Q4-1608), for the first quarto of *Titus* does not run page for page with any other.

Dr. Adams begins his Introduction by calling attention to the existence in the Folger Library of a hitherto unknown chap-book: "The History of Titus Andronicus, the Renowned Roman General. . . . Newly translated from the *Italian* Copy printed at Rome. London: Printed and Sold by C. Dicey in Bow Church-Yard, and at his Wholesale Warehouse in Northampton." This is undated, but must belong to the period 1736-64. From the account given by Dr. Adams it appears that the story is identical with that of the play, and if we assume that the title-page is correct in stating that the book was translated from Italian, we must, I think, conclude that in some earlier form this chap-book or its Italian original was the long-sought source. Dr. Adams does not, however, seem to have been able to trace any Italian form of the book, and until something of the sort is found we cannot exclude the possibility that the chap-book was itself derived from the play, as the ballad which is printed with it seems to have been. It is to be hoped that Dr. Adams will give us a reprint of the chap-book at an early date.

The copy of the 1594 quarto, Dr. Adams tells us, at one time formed part of a composite volume. It was removed from this and seems to have been bound in paper covers in Sweden in or soon after 1770. Its earliest known possessor was one Charles Robson (1735-94), an accountant in Stockholm, whose grandfather, born about 1615, had emigrated from Scotland to Sweden. The book itself is minutely described and Dr. Adams gives us a careful discussion of the textual relationships of the three quartos of 1594, 1600, and 1611 and of the First Folio text.

A very useful feature of the Introduction is the two pages of notes dealing with certain words, etc., in the collotypes where the reading might seem open to doubt. It is of course well recognized that even the best possible monochrome reproductions may not be so clear in all points as the originals. In particular a stain which owing to its colour may, in the original, hardly interfere at all with



the legibility of the print may in the facsimile obscure this in a far greater degree. In the case of all the doubtful points which have been noticed the correct readings have therefore been given from the book itself. Two further notes of the kind might, however, have been added.

On E 4 (III. i. 66) is the line :

Speake *Lauinea*, what accursed hand,

and over the *e* of *Lauinea* is a circular blot in the centre of which is something resembling an acute accent. What is this ? Metrically the name Lavinia has here to be treated as accented on the penultimate syllable, whereas elsewhere in the play the accent is on "*in*". Is this mark a *printed* accent, in which case it would be most unusual, or has someone added an accent with a pen in order to show how the name is to be spoken here, or is it merely an accidental and meaningless mark ? One would have liked to be told.

On I2 two words are badly obscured by a dark smudge. They are presumably "betweene" and "breake," but it would have been as well to assure us of this.

R. B. McK.

**Francis Meres's Treatise "Poetrie" :** a critical edition by DON CAMERON ALLEN. The University of Illinois (University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, vol. XVI, Nos. 3-4). Urbana : the University of Illinois Press. 1933. Pp. 158. \$1.50.

A REPRINT of the whole of Meres's *Palladis Tamia*, 1598, would have been very welcome, for the book is scarce and by no means without interest, but I doubt if there was much need for a new edition of the poetry section alone, for this had been at least thrice reprinted and is readily accessible in Gregory Smith's *Elizabethan Critical Essays*. The text, however, occupies but 20 pages of Mr. Allen's volume and the remainder forms an interesting and valuable contribution to the study of what may be called the quotation literature of the sixteenth century. It is well known that, following the methods used in the teaching of Latin composition, many of the Elizabethans were in the habit of embellishing their English writings with scraps gathered either from their own reading or more frequently from collections of quotations, anecdotes, and remarkable "facts" of

natural history, most of which was originally compiled as aids to Latin composition. Among such compilations were the *Adagia* and *Parabolæ* of Erasmus, the *Officina* of Ravisius Textor, the *Facetiæ* of Domitius Brusonius, and the innumerable books of *sententiæ*, quotations from the poets and the like, ranging from little pocket-books to the amazing work of Conrad Wolffhart or Lycosthenes the *Theatrum Vitæ Humanæ*. This last, as completed and edited by Theodore Zwinger, in 1565, runs to some 1,430 folio pages, and, had not the projected index of proper names had to be omitted "*propter instantes nundinas*," might have saved later researchers a world of trouble, for it must surely contain—if one could only find them—all the "*exempla*" that there ever were, and it gives in most cases an indication of their source!

Meres's work is in form a comparison between the poets of his own time and those of antiquity, and Mr. Allen shows conclusively that so far as the classical side of the comparison is concerned it is no more than a patchwork made up mainly from the *Officina* of Textor, while for the modern side great use had been made of Ascham, Webbe, Puttenham, Sidney, and others. Indeed, if all that is quoted almost verbally from the sources which Mr. Allen has identified were removed, the amount to be credited to Meres himself would be little indeed, though this of course does not mean that Meres was a plagiarist according to the ideas of his own time. He was merely constructing a book in accordance with the literary precepts and practices which had been impressed upon him at school.

After an account of Meres and his other writings and of the opinions that have been held of him as a critic, Mr. Allen describes the use of books of quotations and the like in the regular teaching of Latin prose composition, and outlines the usual course of study both at elementary school and university. A statement made in this connection, that from 1550 to 1598 there were only twenty-one editions and translations printed in England of works of Cicero, can hardly, I think, be correct. Miss Henrietta Palmer's *List of English Editions and Translations of Greek and Latin Classics printed before 1641*, which the editor does not mention, gives for the period in question about fifteen editions, to which at least three might be added, and about nineteen translations. Actually I suspect that there were many more editions of those classical texts which were read in schools than have been recorded. Such books are among the

least likely to survive, as they were quite without interest to a succeeding generation.

The remainder of the introduction is devoted to examples of Meres's use of the sources mentioned, showing in detail the way in which he did his work. Two points may here be mentioned. On p. 38 Mr. Allen is troubled because Meres spells "Porcius Licinius," whereas the edition of the *Officina* which he has used has "Portius." But my copy of the edition of Venice, 1566, spells "Porcius". Further, Meres refers to the satyrist Lucilius, whom Mr. Allen has not found in Textor. But he occurs in the paragraph about Horace, who, it is stated, "in Satyris imitatus est Lucilium." In neither case, therefore, is there any need to suppose that Meres had recourse to Petrus Crinitus.

The text of Meres is followed by appendices. The first of these, on "The Grammar Schools of the English Renaissance," gives the curricula of six important schools and a summary of the course of classical teaching at Eton. One, entitled "A Contribution to the Bibliography of Renaissance Latin Quotation Books," could, I think, easily have been extended. A full annotated list of all the books of this class, including also the *apophthegmata*, *sententiæ*, and the other scrap-books such as those of the *mirabilia* type would be most valuable. The fourth appendix, "A Short History of the Classical Scholarship of England during the Renaissance," seems to attempt too much in too short a space. Lastly we have a number of pages of small-print notes on Meres's text. Here, I think, the author might well have omitted a great deal concerning the English authors referred to, especially as the material seems to be merely extracted from the *D.N.B.*, which the progress of research during the last thirty years has rendered no longer a safe guide.

We may perhaps be allowed to hope that Mr. Allen will continue his work on the Elizabethan books of scraps. They may seem at first sight an inferior and derivative class of literature and unworthy of serious study, but all who have tried to arrive at a real and sympathetic understanding of any Elizabethan author, especially of one who had been through the normal training of school and university, know how essential is a knowledge of this literary fashion of embellishment by quotations and examples. Indeed, with some authors the innumerable citations from such works as the *adagia*, etc., form so efficient a protective armour against the modern reader that it is only when we come to recognize them for the mere

superficial trappings that they are, and so to ignore them, that we can catch even a glimpse of the man himself and his real knowledge and outlook on the world.

R. B. McK.

**Costume in the Drama of Shakespeare and his Contemporaries.** By M. CHANNING LINTHICUM. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1936. Pp. xii+307. 15s. net.

THIS book is an exceedingly useful one, and is certain to find a place on the reference shelf of all students of Elizabethan literature. The task which Miss Linthicum set herself was well worth attempting, and she has performed it with considerable industry.

In considering it, however, it is necessary to bear in mind the limits which the author has imposed on herself. "The study aims at giving sufficient historical background for an understanding of references to costume; it does not intend to give a *complete* historical or economic discussion of any one phase," the Preface states. The book is primarily a dictionary of colours, cloths, and articles of clothing, with a plentiful citation of references to plays of the period with which it deals. The title is at first sight deceptive, for the reader who comes to the book expecting a systematic discussion of Henslowe's accounts and inventories, of items in the Revels accounts, of masquing suits and Inigo Jones's designs, or, in fact, any general discussion of stage costuming, will be disappointed. But once the limitations of the book are realized, it becomes pointless to indicate such omissions; Miss Linthicum's work is an essential preliminary to the study of such topics as those just mentioned, and it is to be hoped that she herself will be able at some future date to investigate them.

The preface begins by stating that "to be valuable to a student, editor, or producer of drama, a work on costume should give dated information supported by evidence, documentary and pictorial." In two respects, however, Miss Linthicum has fallen somewhat short of her ideal. In the first place, it ought to be possible to date some fashions more precisely than she has done. It is not particularly helpful to a student of the drama to be told that a certain type of garment was worn between 1570 and 1630, but it would sometimes help him a great deal to know that it was most fashionable during a certain decade. One realizes, of course, that certain modes

lingered on in the country for many years after they had been abandoned in fashionable circles; nevertheless, a study of contemporary portraits would surely show more clearly than has been attempted here to what extent fashions changed or endured at Court, and determine more exactly the period when a given style was in vogue. In the second place, one cannot help wishing that the publishers had found room for a larger number of illustrations. Those included all illustrate rich and aristocratic costume; humbler clothing is altogether omitted, although one would have welcomed the inclusion, say, of a flat cap and a buff jerkin, and, indeed, of any other illustrations which the collections in the London Museum could so easily have supplied.

I have noticed a few minor omissions. There is no explanation of "Bugle Lace" (beaded lace), although it is mentioned in a quotation on p. 84. "Beaten" damask and velvet are mentioned in *The Shoemaker's Holiday*, III. i., and *Ram Alley*, III. i., but not here. "Bases" (not to be confused with "bays" or baize) are referred to in *The Insatiate Countess*, II. i. 31, and Massinger's *Picture*, II. i. 181, and are discussed fully in the *N.E.D.*; they also should have been included. The note on the malpractices of drapers (p. 58) might have been enlarged from Middleton's *Michaelmas Term*, and the article on the purse (p. 276) seems incomplete, for the student of the drama at least, without reference to the manner in which the cutpurses conducted their activities.

Unfortunately several of the technical aspects of the book are not as satisfactory as they ought to be. The sources of a number of the illustrations are not stated and the proof-reading falls short of the standard which one expects from the Clarendon Press. Minor misprints are far too frequent: e.g. "1429" for "1492" on p. 1; "1515" for "1615" on p. 12; "molto & bouni testimoni" and "el prouerbi" for "molti & buoni testimoni" and "il prouerbio" on p. 18; "priute" for "priuate" on p. 25; "tree" and "true" transposed in the verse quotation on p. 26; "Alexander" for "Alexandria" on p. 110; "from, the seamstress" on p. 161; and "XX" at the head of Chapter Ten. Some of the abbreviated titles cited in the footnotes are difficult for anyone unfamiliar with the actual books to trace in the bibliography, and in the bibliography itself the authors' surnames often appear without any initials. Finally, one cannot speak of "Deloney's introduction of *Thomas of Reading*" (p. 68), and a footnote on p. 180, "*Library*, British

Bibliographical Soc., 1928, for possible date," is in a form that is neither precise nor accurate.

R. C. BALD.

**Shakespeare and the Post-Horses : a New Study of "The Merry Wives of Windsor."** By J. CROFTS. (University of Bristol Studies No. 5.) Bristol : published for the University by J. W. Arrowsmith, 1937. Pp. 231. 10s. 6d. net.

THE horse-stealing episode in *The Merry Wives* is altogether a mysterious affair, nor has research uncovered any posting scandal connected with Count Mömpelgart, or any such trick of impersonation as seems to be implied by the fossilized fragments embedded in the play. Professor Crofts, dating the piece 1596-7 in deference to Mr. Hotson's speculations about William Gardiner, has unearthed a very real posting scandal (incidentally in Somerset) which he interweaves with the contemporary intrigues of Essex and the Lord Admiral at Court. Thus the "cozening Germans" became the "cousin-germans" of Elizabeth, and the "Duke de Iarmanie" the Earl of Nottingham<sup>1</sup>; the earlier Windsor version was revamped by Shakespeare for performance at Essex House on 14th February 1598 by the Earl's players, the "third company" suppressed by the Privy Council's letter of the 19th. It is all very ingenious, quite amusing, and highly improbable.

We pass on to the text. There are in the bad quarto of 1602 about a dozen phrases or short sentences that critics have shown some disposition to regard as Shakespeare's, though they are not found in the folio. Professor Crofts observed that these passages tend to occur at intervals of 62 *quarto* lines, or multiples of that number, and he suggests that they are absent from the folio because, standing at the foot of various pages, they had been thumbd away in the manuscript which Shakespeare had before him when revising and partly rewriting the play to produce the later version. But Shakespeare obviously cannot have worked on the pirated report that served as "copy" for the quarto. It follows that the report either agreed exactly and continuously in length with the original manuscript, or (as Professor Crofts appears to think) shortened it throughout in

<sup>1</sup> Incidentally "cosen garmombles" becomes the reporter's version of an actor's slurring of a dangerous allusion to "cousin-germans"—in fact, one might suggest "cosen ger—(mumbles)"!

a constant ratio. Either seems to me inconceivable. Moreover, Shakespeare's revision is assigned to 1597, so that the piratical report, though not printed till 1602, must presumably have been in existence before that date. But the quarto contains a line: "What is the reason that you vse me thus?" which is an actor's interpolation from *Hamlet*, and makes it very unlikely that the performance upon which the report was based can have been earlier than 1600. I can hardly agree with Professor Croft's description of himself as "an unimaginative investigator." At the same time I have no alternative explanation to propose of the curious fact he has observed—if indeed it be a fact and not a mirage.

The author has some interesting speculations concerning the alterations the play must at one time or another have undergone, but they would have been more convincing for greater economy of hypothesis. His final "History of the Play" is almost too imaginative to submit to criticism.

Incidentally the book contains much useful information in regard to the Elizabethan posting system, which is the outcome of considerable research: unfortunately the references to authorities are sometimes careless.<sup>1</sup>

W. W. GREG.

**The Jacobean Drama. An Interpretation.** By U. M. ELLIS-FERMOR. London: Methuen & Co., Ltd. 1936. Pp. xvi+336. 12s. 6d. net.

THE scope of this book is complete—though one hopes that the author will follow it up with another on Caroline drama, if only for the sake of Massinger. Miss Ellis-Fermor is the sole critic of this drama who has considered it as a whole: as dramatic poetry, as

<sup>1</sup> I make no pretence of having examined Professor Croft's use of sources generally, but a chance search in one instance revealed errors which it is to be hoped are not typical. On p. 48 we read: "The Queen's barge was docked within a stone's throw of the Swan Theatre in a yard belonging in 1605, if not earlier, to George Henslowe"; and a note to this on p. 162 runs: "For Henslowe's interest in this wharf see Greg, *Henslowe Papers*, ii. 28, and C.P.S. Dom. 1605, p. 228." Here, to begin with, *Henslowe Papers* should be *Henslowe's Diary*, and "C.P.S." should be "C.S.P." But the *Diary*, of course, is Philip's, and no George is mentioned in it. Reference to the Calendar further shows that it was Philip's wharf where the King's barges were kept: George is a creature of the Professor's imagination. This argues some gift for inaccuracy. The only other note I had occasion to check was a reference to a document in "Chambers, *William Shakespeare*," which turned out to be in *The Elizabethan Stage*. I may have been unlucky.



an embodiment of the "spirit of the age," and as work produced for a contemporary stage. She provides a chapter on the stage and 26 pages of *Biographical Notes*, with bibliographies where they are not otherwise accessible, all of which in itself testifies to hard work. But, as her title shows, her chief concern is with the plays as literature.

This book is not so much one to review as one to discuss with its author page by page. It belongs to that class of books in which, if one does not accept all or some of its conclusions, it is often rather because one has a different mind from its author than because those conclusions are untenable. To adapt Shelley's words, "Of such truths Each to himself must be the oracle." The value of this book is not, first of all, that its views are right or wrong, but that they are so stimulating that the student will return to them again and again as an aid to his own conclusions.

The following are the comments of a single reader on what Miss Ellis-Fermor says of Webster and are offered as a sample of differing and concurring opinions. It seems fair to choose Webster, since he is accorded the unique honour of providing title-page mottoes for the book. Other chapters would have yielded a more continuous series of congratulations, for example, the admirable one on Beaumont and Fletcher or that on Chapman with its perceptive discussion of Byron. But the method of particular criticism which this book seems to demand is at the mercy of limited space.

Miss Ellis-Fermor, in her chapter on Webster, seems too ready to regard him as if he were a romantic lyric-poet of the nineteenth century, that is, as if his writings expressed his own views. In taking the same attitude to Chapman's plays, she argued the justification for it. But in this chapter she assumes that the question What was Webster's opinion? can reasonably be answered from his plays. At the close of the first section of this chapter the verdict is passed as if the evidence was genuine. And in the third section Miss Ellis-Fermor, with this same question in mind, considers the frequent *sententiae* in relation to the wild thinking in between them. If it is legitimate to find Webster in them as Keats is to be found, say, in the *Ode to a Nightingale*, her findings have value:

For the truth is that Webster's instinctive affections carried him further than his conscience cared to follow. By nature he was endowed with a great love of resolution, courage, manliness and originality and a clear perception that good and evil are irrelevances beside the reality of these things.

But in other parts of this chapter Miss Ellis-Fermor implies that Webster's characters are equivalent to people in real life: she speaks of our "knowledge of and intimacy with these people, so that we may understand, as with a lifetime's familiarity, the field of the mind in which each moves." This is having it both ways. So far as these characters are individual persons, or their equivalents, they are uncertain evidence of Webster's philosophy. Miss Ellis-Fermor at times seems to choose to consider them as persons:

The true plot of his play is not the events which proceed upon the surface and are flung off, as it were, as a casual expression, but the progress of the minds of the central figures towards deeper and deeper self-knowledge. . . .

And as instance she cites Bosola, whom she analyses brilliantly:

Our interest in the figure of Bosola . . . is not mainly because, in the service of Ferdinand's mania, he murders the Duchess and brings about unwittingly the death of Antonio, but because of the strange discrepancy between the man he appears, the man he would be, and the man that, unknown to himself, he really is.

This is true of Bosola, but of who else? There is surely very little *progress* towards self-knowledge in Webster's characters. If they are wicked, a mortal wound or poison may give them a sudden twist into the perception of some other law than their own. But the twist is almost accidental. They suddenly see things differently because death has given them a shock. They are slowly disappearing through a trap-door (most of Webster's "ten thousand several doors" with their "strange geometrical hinges" are trap-doors) and they cry out. There is no progress, as with Lear. And, to return to a point in one of the above quotations, can one "understand, as with a lifetime's familiarity, the field of the mind in which each [character] moves"? Their minds are incalculable. As characters they surprise us continually with their actions (or, to be more exact, with the form those actions take), with their thoughts and their imagery.

Miss Ellis-Fermor sometimes seems to weight her quotations wrongly. She speaks of Bosola's "eyes [as being] fixed on reality and he reports it, like Vittoria, 'a mist'." (It is Flamineo, by the way, and not Vittoria who speaks of a mist.) But if one looks at the text (v. v. 94) one finds that Bosola uses the word not as a symbol of reality but simply to fob off further questioning. He has more important things to consider in the minute of life that remains to

him than how he made the mistake of killing Antonio. Miss Ellis-Fermor goes on :

In comparison with this, the ruin brought upon him by his belated resolve to "be mine own example" is only incidental, one of those events that, in Webster's drama, serve primarily the deeper purpose of showing where the thought is tending.

This seems a misreading (v. iv. 77 ff.). Bosola is surely exhibiting what Miss Ellis-Fermor knows is the quality Webster seems most to have admired, the quality she describes as "that kingly one of resolution."

In the last section of the chapter Miss Ellis-Fermor comments on certain dramatic effects, particularly on the use of contrast, finding a similar effect only in Shakespeare. "Again and again, after a tempest of rage, the rushing together of two whirlwinds, there is a sudden pause; the speech that follows seems barely audible by contrast. . . ." This seems a more valuable way of criticizing Webster than that of seeking in him for the system of his private philosophy, and it carries one back to her second chapter, that on Jacobean Dramatic Technique, where she tries—to try is all that is possible—to explain the æsthetic effect of the whole of the *Duchess of Malfi*. Here, although the terminology from music and painting seems at times more fashionable than relevant, she has perceived subtleties of the first importance. This kind of perceptiveness is one of the most valuable qualities a critic can show, and Miss Ellis-Fermor has found plentiful material for exercising her fine share of it.

The misprints of the book are of the kind that are corrected as soon as found, such as Marson (p. 36, note 1), *Appius and Virginius* (182, 183 twice, and index), the "Insatiable Countess" (p. 166). There are some sentences of impossible syntax and some of which the meaning is obscure.

GEOFFREY TILLOTSON.

**Directions for Speech and Style.** By JOHN HOSKINS. Edited by HOYT H. HUDSON. Princeton : Princeton University Press. London : H. Milford. 1935. Pp. xl+122. 11s. 6d. net.

MR. HUDSON is not the first to honour Hoskins's *Directions* with print. Ben Jonson inserted a considerable section of the work in his *Timber* (1641), an insertion not recognized till 1930, so that

Swinburne's praise of the "humour and good sense" of parts of this section really belongs to Hoskins. Thomas Blount took from the same source much of his *Academie of Eloquence*, making alterations to suit the fashions of 1654—Mr. Hudson specifies enough of these changes to show their value for a historian of seventeenth-century prose. Three years later, John Smith borrowed Hoskins *via* Blount for his popular *Mysterie of Rhetorique Unvail'd*. Mr. Hudson is, however, the first to print the *Directions* with the author's name and in its complete form. He has made, therefore, an important contribution to Elizabethan studies. (One wonders how long Hoskins's excellent poems will have to wait for their collector and if there is still a hope of finding that "booke of poemes . . . bigger than Dr. Donne's poemes, which his sonn Benet lent to he knowes not who, about 1653, and could never heare of it since.") In printing the *Directions* in full Mr. Hudson has been encouraged by his well-founded belief that as "a convenient introduction" to a "rather difficult subject" it is superior to the treatises of Wilson and Puttenham. Hoskins was trying to be clear and simple. His aim, to quote Mr. Hudson's introduction, was

to instruct a young gentleman of the Temple in the best modes of speech and writing. As . . . a student of rhetoric for many years he believed that he could make a new classification of figures, one more useful and simple, perhaps, than the classifications made by previous writers. With the *Directions* he gave to the young man a copy of the *Arcadia* . . . which he had profusely annotated in the margins.

As a text-book the *Directions* is too brief, of course, to be complete—it extends only to fifty pages in this reprint. It is incomplete partly because the capacities of the young gentleman of the Temple had to be borne in mind and partly because, even in 1599, prose was already becoming less tied up with the figures. Hoskins is sceptical of the value of some of his material. He is found wondering how some of these devices will look as time goes on. He knows well how fashions have changed even in his own experience:

there are such schisms of eloquence that it is enough for any ten years that all the bravest wits do imitate some one figure which a critic hath taught some great personage. So it may be within this two hundred years we shall go through the whole body of rhetoric. It is true that we study according to the predominancy of courtly inclinations: whilst mathematics were in request, all our similitudes came from lines, circles, and angles; whilst moral philosophy is now a while spoken of, it is rudeness not to be sententious. And for my part, I'll make one. I have

used and outworn six several styles since I was first Fellow of New College.

Hoskins is interested in the effects which figures produce on the reader or audience, and the reader and audience he has in mind are more nearly ordinary people than the courtiers who set the fashions. (We are already far away from Castiglione and nearer to Molière's cook.) It is a great merit of Hoskins that he has so sound, strong, and original a mind for discriminating these effects.

Mr. Hudson has framed his modernized text with a useful and well-informed introduction and a series of notes equivalent in bulk to the text. In an appendix he has printed and discussed the "fustian speech" (he has discovered three texts of it) which Hoskins mentions and which was delivered by him during the Christmas revels, probably of 1597-8, at the Middle Temple. One or two points call for mention. Hoskins's excellent words on *Euphues* are followed by: "But Lyly himself hath outlived this style and breaks well from it." This remark Mr. Hudson finds puzzling, "unless the later among his plays . . . were in [Hoskins's] mind." But surely Hoskins means the plays as a whole. On p. 59 Mr. Hudson repeats the wrong date cited in *N.E.D.* for the *Reliquiae Wottonianæ*, which is not 1639 but 1651. The proper date improves the point he is making. The passage on the change of verbal fashions quoted above receives no note. Perhaps its thorough investigation would need the space of a Ph.D. thesis. (Its bearing on metaphysical poetry would be specially well worth examination.) But Mr. Hudson might have said when Hoskins became Fellow of New College and mentioned this fellowship in the biographical section of his introduction. Hoskins presumably held it between 1588, when he took his Bachelor's degree, and 1592, when he was sent down for the licence of his speech as *terræ filius*.

GEOFFREY TILLOTSON.

**Life in a Noble Household, 1641-1700.** By GLADYS SCOTT THOMSON. London: Jonathan Cape, Ltd. 1937. Pp. 407. 12s. 6d. net.

THIS is one of those happy books in which the author's pleasure in compilation becomes the reader's delight. The opportunity was undoubtedly great, for the documents were both numerous and

complete; Miss Scott Thomson's training and experience enable her to assimilate all this material and make of it a very readable story in which successive chapters take us from kitchen to cellar, to the stables and garden, back to the picture-gallery, with a peep into the wardrobe, and so on.

The usual domestic accounts of this period are rather a jumble of estate and domestic matters, but Woburn was on such a scale that it had to be departmentalized; there was a receiver-general, a clerk of the kitchen, a steward of the household, a gentleman of the privy purse, and so on. The money flowed in from the various estates net, after the outgoings had been deducted; the officials at Bedford House in the Strand or at Woburn Abbey kept a very tight rein over its disbursement, and their vouchers form the groundwork of this complete survey of domestic expenditure in the grand manner. Miss Thomson had, no doubt, good reason for it, but some may regret that in her frequent introduction of the actual voucher's wording she has, as a general rule, adopted modern spelling. As an illustration of the phonetic value of reproducing the irregular spelling of this very period one has only to think of the *Verney Memoirs* which are often quoted for that very reason—as by Professor Wyld in his *Modern Colloquial English*.

The ample records which the fifth Earl, and subsequently first Duke, of Bedford caused to be kept furnish some matters of historical importance. Thus the chapter on the wine-cellar tells us much, and Miss Thomson wisely consulted M. Simon, who assured her that the occurrence of "shably" in 1664 constitutes its first mention in a wine-book. Strangely it is not entered in the index (which is unworthy of the book), either under S or under C; it actually occurs on p. 191. When speaking of the introduction of port to the Earl's cellar in 1684 Miss Thomson says, "It would be pleasant to add that its introduction coincided with the arrival of the Earl's attacks of gout and the necessity for his visits to Tunbridge Wells to drink the waters. Unfortunately the gout considerably preceded the tasting of the new drink."

It is very surprising to find that pike were brought from the Thorney estate *alive* in barrels, and very costly their conveyance was; a sample cost of sixteen of different sizes worked out at nearly a guinea each delivered. These were for restocking the ponds, not for immediate consumption. But one learns many strange things from this remarkable book; for instance, falconry was



continued on rather a grand scale, but neither the Earl nor his sons seem to have used a gun, at least none was bought for them.

The chapter on the Library is disappointing, almost inevitably ; for Miss Thomson, whilst telling us that Milton's views were entirely to the Earl's taste, says that none of the works of the greatest poet of the period were put into the library at Woburn ; adding, neatly enough, that the Earl " took his theology, as he took his politics, dry." Whatever books fail to provide is compensated for in the picture-gallery, where we have canvases by Van Dyck, Lely, and Kneller, and sometimes we find the original receipt for the picture printed.

The variety of subjects prevents the book from ever being dull ; if it were Miss Thomson's wit would save it : thus, speaking of a new chariot obtained in 1682, she mentions that it was decorated by Mr. Pink, the painter, " whose name goes far to justify the invention of the game of Happy Families." Or when the Earl was over eighty and sat down to an apparently liberal supper, she speaks of the dismay it must have caused his doctor and his daughter, " both of whom wasted a good deal of energy in protesting against the heavy meals which he so much enjoyed, especially in the evening."

The book, as will be gathered, is addressed to a wider public than Dryasdust, and that is all to the good, as it must teach much about the seventeenth century to those who might not otherwise gain the knowledge. In conclusion it must be said that Miss Thomson has shown us from every point of view how a wealthy peer lived—from his Garter banner to his pills, we know what he paid for everything. Miss Thomson wisely gives us prices and leaves us to form our own ideas of the modern equivalent ; but nobody doubted that a rich Duke *could* live somehow ; what we should like to know is how the casual worker in the garden in 1671 (p. 245) managed to exist at a rate of pay which varied from " tenpence to as much as eighteenpence a day according to the nature of the work."

GEORGE ELAND.



**Government and the Press, 1695-1763.** (Oxford Books on Bibliography.) By LAURENCE HANSON. London: Oxford University Press. 1936. Pp. ix + 149. 21s. net.

To attempt to write a book about the press is at once a fascinating and a heart-breaking undertaking: fascinating because it has, for subject matter, the very life-blood of history; heart-breaking because even the simplest of its problems cannot be resolved without considerable study of the numerous other problems related to it. Even if the student confines himself to a comparatively brief period, as Mr. Laurence Hanson has done, he cannot be sure of the truth of any generalizations that he makes about it unless he has a comprehensive and detailed knowledge of the preceding periods. It would not be difficult to take one of Mr. Hanson's generalizations and, by referring to the previous history of the press, to show that it is not wholly accurate. For example, on p. 32 he tells us that in the eighteenth century "it was a breach of privilege to print the proceedings of either House without permission. This was a legacy of Charles I's reign, when the attempt to arrest the five members had made the Commons anxious that their proceedings should not be reported out of doors. And a usage which was in origin a defence against royal interference was continued long after the need for it had ceased. . . ." This generalization makes no allowance for the Commons' understandable and surely pardonable desire to prevent not so much the reporting as the *misreporting* of their proceedings. The action that the Commons took was in part a measure of legitimate defence against mischievous and irresponsible news-writers. Even parliamentary Decrees and Ordinances were misreported; and the need for a safeguard against this misreporting continued long after the "royal interference" had been removed—as long, indeed, as the Civil War, or the danger of its revival, lasted. Even after the Restoration the government had good reason for a strict surveillance of the press. The war was over, but the possibility of a new outbreak was never remote. Mr. Hanson's statement is, thus, an over-simplification of the problem.

Or, to take another generalization: Mr. Hanson says on p. 49, "The right to seize papers went undisputed until Wilkes brought his action against Wood, and it was not until the case of *Entick v. Carrington* that it was declared illegal. Only then was it realized what large powers had been exercised by the Secretaries of State

and what authority was lodged in their deputies, the messengers." To say that the right of search went undisputed until the time of Wilkes is to forget the early history of the press and the Stationers' Company. The right of search was based on the royal prerogative. Objections to that right were raised almost at once, and were based on the more ancient rights of personal liberty. As far back as October 1582 the Wardens of the Stationers' Company complained to Lord Burghley that a certain printer and his family had refused to let them search his house (see Arber's *Transcript of Stationers' Register*, II. 777). So many examples, from the seventeenth century also, could be given of the sturdy refusal to admit the government's right of search and right of seizing papers, that Mr. Hanson's statement that the right went undisputed until the time of Wilkes obviously errs.

In his Preface Mr. Hanson describes the limits of his enquiry: "This is an account of the relationship between the government and the press from the expiration of the Licensing Act to the publication of No. 45 of the *North Briton*. I have dealt almost exclusively with the newspaper press, and I have gone beyond the limits which I set myself to summarize the legal consequences which followed the prosecution of Wilkes, without attempting to rewrite his biography. I have deliberately omitted all mention of government prosecutions for indecency and blasphemy. This is a study in politics, not in morals."

On p. 71, however, Mr. Hanson does mention the subject of government prosecutions for indecency. He tells of the "few Jacobite tracts that were suppressed after the '45," and of the "printers of obscenities who were arrested under pressure from the Bishops." Mr. Hanson does not need to be told that a study of the "relationship between the government and the press" is incomplete if it does not deal with "government prosecutions for indecency and blasphemy." It is historically true to say that nearly every attempt to change the public mind on religious, moral, or political questions has been branded by the established authorities as blasphemous, obscene, or seditious. Walter Bagehot shrewdly observed that "no one knows what blasphemy is, or what sedition is, but all know that they are vague words which can be fitted to any meaning that shall please the ruling powers."

Mr. Hanson's book deals with "the Law," "the administration of the Law," and the "Government Press": and he studies these

subjects in their political, and not in their legal or moral, aspects. Within these limits the book is an invaluable, but unhappily also an exasperating, contribution to learning. It is exasperating mainly because it is so badly indexed. The chief value of a book of this sort is as a book of reference. It is so scantily and haphazardly indexed, however, that, short of reading the entire book through again, the student in search of information on a particular point will never be certain where, if at all, it is to be found. There is hardly a page that does not contain some important name or fact omitted from the index. Mr. Hanson might consider issuing separately an index—for the book is of sufficient merit and importance to warrant it.

Then, again, Mr. Hanson's prose style, though it is serviceable, is at times clumsy and lacking in vitality. The purist will be irritated by the occasional grammatical errors; for example, p. 7, line 17: "... matters in which neither State nor Church were concerned" (surely "State" and "Church" take the singular verb?); p. 46, line 36: "But under later monarchs, like the Privy Council, they abdicated their powers"; p. 32, line 32: "... they were only discharged by the payment of fees . . ."

It is quite safe to say that many people will go to Mr. Hanson's book not to read a general account of the law and its administration but to find out what new information is to be had on some particular, perhaps small, subject: what new facts, let us say, concerning the printers of the period. The new facts are to be found, and Mr. Hanson is to be congratulated on their discovery; but the inadequacy of the indexing means that the reader will probably lose trace of them if he does not immediately make a note of them. Further—and this is a more serious objection—they are not always presented with the necessary decisiveness and clarity. For example, on p. 52 we read: "In 1718 John Reynolds betrayed his master Philip Bishop, the printer of *Nero Secundus*, and again the government was compelled to find him alternative employment, since he had drawn upon himself 'the inveterate enmity and hatred of the disaffected.'" None of the names in this passage is mentioned in the Index, nor is there any footnote to tell us anything about Reynolds (presumably an apprentice) or about Philip Bishop or about *Nero Secundus*. The student who is fortunate enough to possess or have access to a copy of Plomer's *Dictionary of Printers, 1668-1725*, learns that Plomer gives the date of Bishop's death as "about 1716." It would, therefore, be helpful to know the source

of Mr. Hanson's information, for, if the facts are correct, then it supplements and corrects Plomer's note.

Numerous examples could be given of this lack of decisiveness and lack of clarity and lack of adequate documentation and indexing, and the lack of these mars the usefulness of a book that is otherwise to be highly commended. Here is one last example.

On p. 45 Mr. Hanson says: "Edmund Bohun relates that after his high Tory pamphlet *King William and Queen Mary Conquerors* had suffered the indignity of being burnt by the common hangman on the order of the House of Commons, it was well received in Cambridge." The index, here, is helpful. The reader in search of information about Edmund Bohun is referred to pp. 7 and 45. On p. 7 the first reference to Bohun mentions only his surname: "Bohun, the last of them [the licensers], in his naive biography, explains . . ." Then we are told that "he [Bohun] was ensnared into passing Charles Blount's pamphlet, *King William and Queen Mary Conquerors*, which expressed not the views of Blount himself but the uncompromising high Tory opinions which Bohun was known to favour."

Unless the reader already knows something of the story, which he will find related in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, he may be misled by Mr. Hanson's references: "Charles Blount's pamphlet" (p. 7); "Edmund Bohun . . . after his high Tory pamphlet . . ." (p. 45). The story, as related by Mr. Hanson, may well puzzle the general reader: (1) Blount writes a pamphlet that does not express his own views; (2) the views expressed are those of Bohun, the licenser; (3) Blount traps Bohun into giving his imprimatur; (4) the pamphlet is suppressed and Parliament recommends that Bohun be removed from his post as licenser; (5) the pamphlet (p. 45) is referred to as Bohun's. The uninformed reader wonders: (1) Whether the pamphlet was really Blount's or Bohun's; (2) why Blount, if it was his, wrote it when it did not express his own views; (3) by what means Bohun was "ensnared" into passing it; (4) why Bohun and not Blount should have been punished.

It would be unfair to recommend, as we do, the purchase of this book and not to mention at the same time its deficiencies. Students of the subject will be greatly indebted to Mr. Hanson—and also a little exasperated that the debt is not greater.

The book contains a useful Bibliography and the following

Appendixes : I. Proposals for Regulating the News-papers. By John Toland. II. A Particular of the Cases now under prosecution, with states thereof. 23 October 1718. III. State of Prosecutions now depending against Persons taken up by virtue of his Grace the Duke of Newcastle's Warrants. 13 February 1737/8. IV. English Gazette Account from the 1st of June to the 13th of June 1710. V. The London Journal. VI. Directions to the Printer of the National Journal how to place or Range the Articles of News. 1746.

WILLIAM M. CLYDE.

**Samuel Richardson : Printer and Novelist.** By ALAN DUGALD MCKILLOP. Chapel Hill : The University of North Carolina Press ; London : Oxford University Press. 1936. Pp. xii+357. \$4.00 ; 18s. net.

It is difficult for us to recreate in imagination Richardson's past fame, which was, in his own day, an international phenomenon. His novels were translated into half the languages of Europe ; he was solemnly ranked with the supreme writers of all time ; and his death was commemorated by a magnificent *Éloge* composed by Diderot. Now the mention of his name may only prompt the condescending smile, and readers who could pass an elementary examination in his works must be few indeed. But he was the progenitor of a new kind of writing, and the comparative failure of his many imitators determines the measure of his achievement.

In Richardson's lifetime his fame was more spectacular on the Continent than in his own country, although even in England his vanity was seldom seriously wounded. In our own time, also, he seems to command more attention abroad than here. M. Paul Dottin's excellent study, published in 1931, is succeeded by Mr. McKillop's detailed and scholarly work, which comes from America. This book is the fruit of many years of interest in its subject. In addition to sources for a study of Richardson used by previous biographers and commentators, including the six folio volumes of Richardson papers preserved in the Forster Collection, Victoria and Albert Museum, Mr. McKillop has searched diligently and with good results through contemporary periodicals, pamphlets, and books, English and Continental. He has made admirable use of whatever material he has found of value illustrative of Richardson

himself and his influence, and he has documented his text with excellent and informative footnotes. Although, furthermore, this book is primarily a re-examination of Richardson's work, the appendix, containing records of the novelist's life and business, is more than a useful summary.

Mr. McKillop adds a selective bibliography. The section headed "*Works*" is, perhaps, a little confusing for the ordinary reader, and might have been annotated. It is not clear how far Richardson was, or was not, responsible for the contents of volumes of extracts; and a publisher's revision of Defoe's *Tour* has a doubtful claim to appear as one of his *Works*.

HAROLD WILLIAMS.

**From Richardson to Pinero: Some Innovators and Idealists.** By FREDERIC S. BOAS. London: John Murray. 1936. Pp. vii+280. 8s. 6d. net.

THE essays collected in this miscellany cover a variety of themes, having been written for different occasions and at widely distant dates. Underlying this diversity, however, is the unity of an individual taste and judgment common to them all. The reader who follows Dr. Boas through his course is left with an agreeable sense of contact with a personality matured and enriched through long devotion to literature in the broadest sense, a book-lover who transcends the mere antiquarian by instinctively looking for the present significance of past achievement. A concluding note on Tennyson,

It is one of the tests of genius that its utterances are perpetually proving their value and aptness in unforeseen applications,

reflects the method of treatment applied to each of these "innovators and idealists," including Richardson, Thackeray, Wordsworth, Kean, the Brownings, Hallam, Matthew Arnold, and Pinero. Even the essay on Wordsworth's patriotic poems, written during the war, is free from the common defects of such "occasional" criticism; for though to-day it may be felt that the poetry of Wordsworth is further removed from the group-mentality of the trenches than that of Sassoon and Owen, this impression does not impair the value or permanence of those broader Wordsworthian ideals which form the main theme of discussion. It would be equally unjust to accuse the



writer of special pleading on the score of his discriminating analysis of Tennyson's *Idylls* as a continuous allegory of the warfare between sense and spirit that, in the aftermath of war, may have acquired "a significance which it lacked for a generation which had not known, nor even dreamt of, such a cataclysm." In detailed exposition Dr. Boas appears to special advantage, as shown particularly in his judicious estimate of Richardson—the fullest and perhaps the best study in the volume—and again in the essay on *Paracelsus*, where due recognition is paid not only to Browning's intellectual power and skill in the treatment of material but also to his mastery of poetic technique. The paper on Kean renders accessible some valuable material that reveals the great actor as an innovator challenging the orthodox classical school; that on Pinero presents a useful survey of the transition from nineteenth to twentieth century drama and gains additional interest from the notes of personal reminiscence. In brief, Dr. Boas has provided a companionable volume abounding in suggestive comment on each of the subjects under consideration.

B. E. C. DAVIS.

**Swift's Marriage to Stella together with Unprinted and Misprinted Letters.** By MAXWELL B. GOLD. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1937. Pp. x + 189. \$2.50; 10s. 6d. net.

It is difficult to conceive clearer reasoning and better presentment of a case than Dr. Gold's handling of his argument in this book. He avoids irrelevant appeal, he never departs from the exact letter of his evidence nor attempts to suggest more than his witnesses stated or could know. In open court few juries could remain unmoved; and in the quiet of a library, contemplating at leisure and after two centuries the witnesses and their stories, remembering something more of them also, the evidence is singularly persuasive if not entirely convincing.

Whether Swift was secretly married to Stella or not is a problem which has long been in dispute, although nobody has ever suggested that the marriage was consummated or that it was much more than an empty ceremony. But, as Dr. Gold pertinently observes, there are questions which the biographer of Swift "must answer if we



grant the premise of an empty ceremony." Equally, it may be added, there are questions which the biographer must answer if he denies that any ceremony ever took place. The question is not purely academic.

In his introduction Dr. Gold states the purpose of his essay tersely. It is an attempt "to demonstrate that Swift and Stella were married about the year 1716, and that Swift offered to acknowledge the marriage publicly." In addition Dr. Gold gives "reasons for a belief that a pathological unfitness for the married state was the reason why Swift never lived with Stella."

Dr. Gold's statement of the whole case is so admirable that his book would have been fully justified had he done no more than review those arguments for and against which have been debated before. But he is able, in addition, to call new evidence in the form of an interleaved and annotated copy of Lord Orrery's *Remarks* (1752) on Swift preserved in the Harvard College Library. The notes, which were entered before the publication of the work, are written by a copyist, with brief certifications in Orrery's own handwriting. They contain extracts from letters from Mrs. Whiteway affirming the undoubted marriage of Swift and Stella. They confirm, furthermore, details relative to the date of the marriage and Stella's refusal of Swift's offer of acknowledgment contained in the printed accounts of Delany, Deane Swift, Mrs. Pilkington, Dr. Johnson, Berkeley, and Orrery himself. The evidence is the more important when we consider Mrs. Whiteway's long acquaintance-ship with Swift and her constant association with him during the latter years of his life. We know, furthermore, that Swift held her in high regard; and there is no reason to doubt the substantial accuracy of Orrery's extracts from her letters. This new evidence, carrying us close to the principals involved, adds weight to the consensus of eighteenth-century belief.

Although it has not always been kept in mind or fully appreciated, practically all the eighteenth-century evidence supports and all Swift's early biographers accept the fact of a secret marriage between the Dean and Stella. All the evidence to the contrary is contained in a manuscript note by Dr. Lyon in a copy of Hawkesworth's *Life* of Swift now in the Forster Collection, South Kensington. Dr. Gold succeeds in showing that the note was copied from a first draft written in July 1765, that is, nearly twenty years after Swift's death, and it does not definitely appear that the original note was composed

by Lyon himself. He may have been copying the work of another. Yet the negative evidence with which Churton Collins (*Jonathan Swift*, 1893) makes so much play—Mrs. Dingley, Mrs. Brent, Mrs. Ridgeway, Dr. Corbet, and Rochford—is all contained in this one note. It must be admitted, by those who doubt a marriage, that Monck Mason and Churton Collins, two of the leading counsel against the fact, do not make the best possible showing. Monck Mason is unfair, Collins is vague and rhetorical. Furthermore their attempt to dismiss, on the ground of impossibility in dates, Monck Berkeley's statement that Bishop Berkeley was directly informed of the marriage by Ashe who performed the ceremony, recoils upon themselves, for the dates they assumed are now shown to be incorrect. Monck Berkeley's account, which they rejected with supreme contempt, emerges as a strong piece of evidence.

Unless new evidence comes to light there will be no need to restate the arguments in favour of a secret marriage. No one could present them more cogently than Dr. Gold has done. His little book is a model of scholarship, clear thinking, and orderly arrangement.

We may not all be persuaded, for the evidence comes short of complete conviction. Does not Dr. Gold exaggerate Lyon's want of acquaintanceship with Swift and the affairs of the deanery? How far were the early witnesses and biographers united in drawing their belief from general rumour? Why is there no documentary evidence of the marriage? As Dr. Kirkpatrick has recently pointed out (*The Times Literary Supplement*, June 19, 1937), the canons of the Church of Ireland permitted marriage only after the publication of banns or by episcopal licence. They enforced the public performance of the ceremony in church or chapel, and enjoined due registration. If, as the story runs, Ashe married Swift and Stella secretly in the garden, he must have known, and Swift also, that the marriage was an empty and illegal ceremony. Are we to believe that Swift would impose such a deception on the woman he loved? On the other hand it must be admitted that contemporary believers in the marriage, two of them clerics, found no difficulty in the story.

In a useful appendix, unrelated to the main part of his work, Dr. Gold gives transcripts from letters by Swift to Orrery, Motte, and Arbuthnot (from originals in the Pierpont Morgan Library, New York) which correct and supplement Dr. Ball's edition of the *Correspondence*.

HAROLD WILLIAMS.

**De Quincey at Work.** By W. HALLAM BONNER. Buffalo: Airport Publishers. 1936. Pp. 112. \$1.75.

IN *De Quincey at Work*, Professor Bonner prints one hundred and thirty letters, written with two exceptions during the last decade of De Quincey's life, between 1851 and 1860. The originals, not hitherto published, belong for the most part to the Huntingdon Library, the Buffalo Public Library, and the private collection of Professor Horace Eaton of Syracuse University, author of the recent volume entitled *Thomas de Quincey*. The bulk of the letters

are notes . . . to James Hogg, De Quincey's Edinburgh publisher and his son, and friendly letters from De Quincey's daughters . . . to Mr. and Mrs. James Fields of the firm of Ticknor, Reed & Fields of Boston. . . .

And the tale these letters tell . . . is a tale of the spell of James T. Fields cast upon the whole De Quincey family, of the sagacity and perseverance required to move De Quincey to act, of the eagerness of the daughters and of De Quincey himself at one time to favour the American edition . . . of the achievement of James Hogg in launching De Quincey upon revision of matter for . . . the Edinburgh edition.

They also contain an account of his death-bed, and some criticism on American authors, especially Hawthorne, whom the daughters particularly admired. The letters cast light on De Quincey's last days and well deserve the scholarly care with which they have been printed "as nearly like the originals as possible, consistent with easy reading." They are also annotated wherever necessary, and are further illuminated by four illustrations—a portrait of De Quincey at the age of 68, a page of letter-manuscript, a page from the American edition showing De Quincey's revisions, and a letter written in the last year of his life. The volume, taken as a whole, is of real value in presenting a life-like picture of De Quincey in his old age, and one which, with all its truthful reproduction of his weaknesses, on the whole tends to better appreciation of the man and of his qualities.

EDITH J. MORLEY.

**George and Sarah Green, A Narrative** by DOROTHY WORDSWORTH. Edited from the original manuscript with a Preface by E. DE SELINCOURT. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1936. Pp. 92. 5s. net.

IN March 1808 George and Sarah Green of Grasmere lost their lives in a snowstorm above Langdale, leaving behind them a destitute

family of children, six of them, of whom the eldest was eleven, still too young to earn their livelihood. The neighbours were deeply stirred by the tragedy, and among them the Wordsworths. The poet composed a ballad on the subject; his sister Dorothy wrote what De Quincey justly styled a "simple and fervid memoir" of the unfortunate pair, and some thirty years later De Quincey himself produced "an elaborate article in *Tait's Magazine* of 1839."

Dorothy's manuscript has not hitherto been printed in its entirety: she refused to set herself "up as an Author," partly from modesty, partly "on account of the family of the Greens" whom she did not wish to injure by notoriety. But she expressly stated that she would not object to publication "thirty or forty years hence . . . if it should be thought that any service would be done." Now, after the lapse of a hundred and twenty-eight years, Professor de Selincourt at last prints in full the tragic little story as she wrote it down, together with an account of the subsequent histories of the children, all of whom lived to a ripe old age. He also describes how assistance was given to them.

Dorothy's story is told with the directness and feeling that we should expect from what we know of her. As her brother desired, she gave "a *minute detail* of all the particulars . . . thinking that the end for which the account was written would be thereby better answered, viz. that of leaving behind a record of human sympathies, and moral sentiments, either as they were called forth or brought to remembrance." Dorothy "trusts entirely to the subject and the emotion which it naturally evokes" and the result is moving in its unvarnished simplicity. Its writer misquotes aptly from the *Excursion*, l. 777-80: "I may say with the Pedlar in the *Recluse*,

I feel  
The story linger in my heart, my memory  
Clings to this poor Woman and her Family."

EDITH J. MORLEY.

**Shelley et la France, Lyrisme anglais et lyrisme français  
au XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle.** By HENRI PEYRE. Cairo: Paul Barbey.  
1935. Pp. 509.

THE whole story of Shelley's fortune in France could be told easily in about fifty pages. At first he is mentioned only as a friend of

Byron, the husband of an eminent woman novelist, the son-in-law of a famous philosopher. A strange anonymous novelette which appeared in the *Mercure du XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle*, vol. 18 (1827), with the title *L'Ami de Lord Byron, ou les Victimes d'un Préjugé*, is typical of this period of Shelley's reputation in France. Its author weaves a lurid tale out of Shelley's life, which he knows very imperfectly, and out of *The Cenci*, which he has never read. Then come the first feeble translations (1834) by Madame Amable Tastu, and the first sympathetic notices by Philarète Chasles. After 1843 critics like E. Alletz, A. Delrieu, E. D. Forgues try to draw French attention on Shelley; between 1853 and 1856 Arthur Dudley (*nom de plume* of Madame Blaze de Bury) in her enthusiastic articles in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* goes so far as to proclaim Shelley the Dante or the Goethe of England; an excellent study, by Odysse Barot, appears in the *Revue Contemporaine* for 1867. But even at this late date, Shelley continues to be ignored or slighted by the great French writers. Baudelaire discovers only in 1865 the *Stanzas written in Dejection near Naples*, and, after quoting from memory: "Je suis de ceux que les hommes n'aiment pas, mais je suis de ceux dont ils se souviennent," exclaims "A la bonne heure! Voilà de la poésie." But he does not seem to have pushed his acquaintance much further, so that he did not come across certain poems of Shelley (chiefly *On the Medusa of Leonardo*) which show the English poet as a forerunner of that Romantic Agony whose chief expression was *Les Fleurs du Mal*. Thus we have reached p. 300 of Professor Peyre's book, and we have learnt that Shelley, although he owed much to French philosophers through the medium of Godwin, despised the landscape, the people, the literature of France; that while Stendhal probably never met Shelley, and Lamartine considered him a second-rate poet, Vigny was never inspired by his verse and Balzac certainly ignored it; we have seen, instead, Professor Peyre discussing at large *lyrisme français* and *lyrisme anglais*, fixing their characteristics, etc., but all this would hardly make up for our disappointment. We have been told, however (p. 152), that only with symbolism "notre pays se trouvera prêt à accueillir et à comprendre pleinement, c'est-à-dire par la sympathie et l'amour, le lyrisme shelleyen," and we have been waiting patiently for the *Quatrième Partie, L'Epoque symboliste*.

An essay by Schuré, translations by Madame Tola Dorian, the studies of Gabriel Sarrazin, the meritorious, if clumsy, translation

of the Complete Works by Félix Rabbe, seem at last to pave the way to the influence of Shelley on the French poets. At last we are going to have some fun. But Professor Peyre continues to shake his head rather gloomily. Literary influence on an original genius like Rimbaud is out of question. "Verlaine connut-il Shelley?" Certainly he must have heard his name. . . . And no matter how much one would like Mallarmé to have preferred to Tennyson "de plus purs et plus vigoureux poètes, un Shelley ou un Keats," one must regretfully conclude that "Shelley semble fort loin de Mallarmé."

But there are minor symbolists, and surely Shelley comes here into his own. Professor Peyre, however, warns us against being too sanguine: "C'est souvent lorsqu'elle croit la mesurer avec de minutieuses statistiques et une précision infaillible que l'histoire littéraire laisse échapper l'essentiel d'une influence. Ce serait une prétention assez vaine que de vouloir mesurer quantitativement quelle fut, sur nos symbolistes, l'action de Shelley. . . . Les symbolistes, trop fortement préoccupés par l'œuvre idéale dont ils rêvaient . . . n'ont guère fait effort pour étudier à loisir ces poèmes, dont ils se contentaient de tirer quelques timides leçons." Well might George Moore speak of Shelley in the most captivating manner to French decadents: they listened, assented, and remained cold; they quoted Shelley's name as that of a vague, distant authority, but they read Poe. "Samain connut-il Shelley?" asks not very encouragingly Professor Peyre. As for Rollinat, he seems to have been "fort peu curieux de lyrisme anglais." Valéry is positive: "Je ne crois qu'il ait exercé sur moi la moindre influence pondérable."

If the poets fail us, university men come to our rescue; and there is no doubt about the importance of Chevrillon's and Koszul's studies on Shelley. But real popularity came only in 1923, when Shelley served as a stalking-horse for A. Maurois's new type of biography, *biographie romancée*. It is a far cry from *L'Ami de Lord Byron ou les Victimes d'un Préjugé* of 1827 to *Ariel* of 1923, at least, so far as narrative art is concerned, but in either case are we not confronted with romance?

It would be unfair to repeat apropos of this well documented, although mostly negative study on Shelley (Professor Peyre is unable to put his finger on a single passage of a great French poet derived from or influenced by Shelley), a notorious opinion of Matthew Arnold on Shelley. But, if Professor Peyre's book is not quite *en*



*l'air*, it nevertheless tends to exasperate the reader no less than Franz Kafka's *The Castle*. Professor Peyre tries, like the Land Surveyor in the German novel, to get into touch with the Castle authorities, *i.e.* to trace the presence of Shelley in French literature: he gets a glimpse of "Klamm" every now and then, but in the end the object of his search remains hopelessly remote.

A few inaccuracies: p. 104, Shelley's body was cremated on the strand of Viareggio, not of Lerici; p. 15, Fr. Thomson should be Fr. Thompson; *vice versa*, on p. 116, Thompson should be Thomson. Many misprints have escaped the proof-corrector, but can be easily put to rights by the reader.

MARIO PRAZ.

**The Evolution of Keats's Poetry.** By C. LEE FINNEY. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: H. Milford. 1936. Two volumes. Vol. I, pp. xx+406; vol. II. pp. x+407-804. \$10.00; 42s. net.

MR. FINNEY's book has clearly been a labour of love, which seems to have occupied him for a dozen years or more. It has certain merits which are, however, in danger of being obscured by some very serious defects. Like many devotees, Mr. Finney has tried to pay tribute to his idol in too many ways at once, with unfortunate results, of which the great length of his book is the most obvious though by no means the most objectionable. The "Publisher's Note" on the dust-cover claims that the book is "biographical criticism rather than critical biography," and adds that the copious MS. material available has been "quoted so extensively that the volume[s] may be used as a source-book as well as a critical survey." What this amounts to is that Mr. Finney has tried to be critic, biographer, and textual commentator all rolled into one, and has not been very successful in any of his roles; though it is true that in the last of them he has provided some new material of value in spite of the awkward and teasing manner in which it is presented.

As a biographical study—critical or otherwise—the book may be briefly dismissed. There is nothing of any consequence which cannot be found as well or better handled in the works of Colvin and Miss Amy Lowell. The intention clearly was to include only so much biographical matter as would contribute directly to our



understanding of the development of Keats's poetical genius ; but Mr. Finney has not been able to resist the temptation to enlarge on such points as Keats's friendships or the *Blackwood's* attack on his poems, which should have been dealt with much more briefly. In consequence the abrupt stop at December 1819, when Keats ceased to write, comes with something of a shock.

The critical parts of the book betray an unhappily divided allegiance—to the late Miss Amy Lowell, whose biography met with a rather mixed reception in 1925, and to Professor J. L. Lowes, whose study of Coleridge, *The Road to Xanadu*, has been universally admired since its appearance in 1927. These two writers might seem to be at one in their interest in the psychology of imagination ; but in fact they have little in common. The supreme merit of Professor Lowes is his strict adherence to the deductive method, while vague " intuitions " and preconceived notions are the continual resource of such writers as Miss Lowell. Mr. Finney has followed Professor Lowes's general line of work in making a diligent research into the traces of Keats's reading discernible in his poetry ; but he has told us less than might have been expected about the mind of Keats, partly perhaps because the *Xanadu* method will only work really well with Coleridge, but certainly also because he has been led astray by Miss Lowell (with help also from Mr. J. M. Murry and others) in pursuit of that elusive will-o'-the-wisp Keats's " philosophy of life." " Optimistic naturalism," " empirical humanism," " negative capability " and the like " high-astounding terms " buzz about our ears till, like Carlyle listening to Coleridge's " om-m-mject " and " sum-m-mject," we feel that it all means very little. Indeed, these attempts to work out a " philosophy " for Keats in anything like the sense in which the word can be applied to the *Weltanschauung* of Browning, of Wordsworth, or even of Shelley, are bound to fail ; their essential absurdity is manifest as soon as we remember that from the Chapman's Homer sonnet to the *Ode to Autumn*—that is, from his first to his last good poem—Keats lived just three years. Professor Garrod, no doubt, went to the other extreme in arguing that Keats's " craving for thought " actually did harm to his poetry ; but this extravagance is less misleading than Mr. Finney's contention that Keats's poetry was " pre-eminently a criticism of life " (p. 572) and that by 1819 he had arrived at " a philosophy which satisfied every faculty of his mind " (p. 741). Mr. Finney, like the rest of his tribe, makes a poor job

of the really perfect poems, such as the *Ode to Autumn* and *The Eve of St. Agnes*, and relies far too much on questionable conclusions drawn from imperfect or fragmentary poems like *Endymion* and the two *Hyperions*—and, of course, above all from the letters.

After the almost pathetic attempt here made to bolster it up, nothing more, surely, ought to be heard of Miss Lowell's perversely ingenious theory that the *Fall of Hyperion* was begun in September 1818, dropped while *Hyperion* (as printed in 1820) was composed (December 1818 to April 1819), and then resumed in the autumn of 1819. There is not a shred of real evidence to show that the "Moneta" version was even thought of till nearly a year after September 1818. Equally unconvincing is Mr. Finney's interpretation of *Lamia*, in which, for instance, "the nuptial feast . . . represents the publication of Keats's poems" and Apollonius "represents the reviewers." The purpose of this odd allegorizing is to get round the difficulty presented by the lines beginning :

Do not all charms fly  
At the mere touch of cold philosophy?

by maintaining that they are a condemnation not of natural philosophy but of its "misapplication," i.e. of "the reviewers who judged Keats's poems by the standard of fact and reason."

It is fair to add that Mr. Finney is much less crotchety on the earlier poems. He has, I think, brought out rather more clearly, and certainly more fully, than earlier writers the extent and nature of Leigh Hunt's influence on Keats. In *Endymion*, as he points out, the "cockneyism" is residuary only, and stylistically its real importance is in marking Keats's emancipation both from the vulgarities of Hunt and from the artificialities of eighteenth-century poetry. The *curiosa felicitas* of *The Eve of St. Agnes* and the odes would have been impossible without the exaggerated Elizabethanism of *Endymion*. Mr. Finney makes a sound point in partial mitigation of sentence on the reviewers: "Keats showed poor judgment in publishing *Endymion* without thorough revision" (p. 447). But I think it would have been news to Keats that the theme of the poem is "the neo-Platonic quest of immortality."

It is in tracing sources, influences, and parallels of phrasing between Keats and earlier writers that Mr. Finney does his most useful work. Here a fair amount, at least, of his material is new; and if a good many of the alleged parallels are purely fanciful or chance similarities, that does no harm, since we can always judge

for ourselves. It is impossible to give adequate illustration in brief compass; but the following are two fairly striking specimens. In Marlowe's translation of Ovid's *Love Elegies* Mr. Finney has found "as if cold Hemlock I had drunke," which is remarkably like the second line of the *Nightingale* ode. And he has run to earth the "onlie begetter" of the early *Ode to Apollo* in *The Pleasure of Poetry*, an ode by an obscure eighteenth-century poet named Vansittart, who is now seen to have had the honour of supplying the youthful Keats with both theme and stanza-form.

Altogether Mr. Finney has compiled a not unimpressive body of "borrowings," none of them (after the earlier period) slavish, and many of considerable interest psychologically as well as technically. But in the absence of a "shaping spirit" comparable to that of Professor Lowes, this material fails to have its full effect, and Mr. Finney would, I think, have been better advised if he had undertaken a straightforward edition of the poetry, with full variant readings and a commentary incorporating all the parallels which he and others have traced. There would certainly be room for such an edition. H. Buxton Forman's is now quite out of date; and Professor de Selincourt's suffers from an inconvenient arrangement of the notes and an inadequate equipment of textual variants, while its commentary, admirable as it is, does not cover the ground as fully as is now seen to be both possible and desirable.

In matters of fact, as distinct from interpretation of facts, Mr. Finney is remarkably trustworthy. I have noted only eight or nine misprints, mostly quite trivial. On p. 255, in line 2 of the first verse quotation, "is" should be "in"; and a phrase at the bottom of p. 571 should, I think, read "frescoes of Orcagna and Benozzo Gozzoli in the Campo Santo." There is a good index, and a valuable feature is the exhaustive catalogue of manuscripts covering pp. 745-77.

R. W. KING.

**Essays and Studies.** By Members of the English Association. Vol. xxii. Collected by HELEN DARBISHIRE. Pp. 158. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1937. Price 7s. 6d. net.

IN the first paper of the present series Professor de Selincourt discusses the autobiographical background to Coleridge's *Dejection*

in its original form, as addressed to Sara Hutchinson. The changes introduced in the two later versions, printed respectively in the *Morning Post* of October 7, 1802, and in *Sybilline Leaves* (1817), tend to obscure the real significance of the poem, which, as a piece of self-revelation, is far more poignant in the earliest version, here printed for the first time. Mr. E. F. Carritt, under the heading "Addison, Kant, and Wordsworth," propounds the view that, contrary to Wordsworth's representation of the poet as a creator of taste, during the eighteenth century "it was the critical theories which anticipated and stimulated the change in creative writing rather than the reverse." This question is too complex to be satisfactorily answered within the limits of a short essay. The novelty of Addison's papers on the Imagination lies rather in subject-matter than in treatment, which savours too much of dilettantism to suggest "the father of modern critical theory"; incidental parallels between Addison or any of the earlier eighteenth-century æstheticians and transcendentalists like Kant and Coleridge serve only to emphasize a fundamental difference in outlook. Mr. Edmund Blunden makes a welcome addition to his Elian researches in a delightful essay on Lamb's contemporaries at Christ's Hospital, including James Boyer, Matthew Feilde, Thornton, Middleton, Richards, and Le Grice. Miss Mary Lascelles is to be congratulated upon contributing the most cogent paper of the series, entitled "Some Characteristics of Jane Austen's Style." Joining issue with those critics who have denied Miss Austen distinction in "manner of writing with regard to language," she cites evidence to the contrary from the correspondence and juvenilia, which show a keen sense of stylistic values, thence proceeding to trace the novelist's progress from the earlier stages of burlesque and the imitation of mannerism to her final conquest of the problem "how to tell her story in terms of the speech and thought of her characters." The object of Dr. Onions' "Experiment in Textual Reconstruction" is, in his own words, "to present the text of portions of *The Owl and the Nightingale* . . . in such a shape that it can be read without the distraction that is inevitably caused by the medley of dialectal forms and the irregularities in spelling and prosody of the two manuscripts in which the poem has been handed down"; the textual uniformity thus obtained should secure more readers for what is probably the most readable long poem of the pre-Chaucerian period. Miss Helen Gardner, in an appreciative study of "Walter Hilton and the English Mystical Tradition," compares Hilton with

his predecessors Richard Rolle and the author of *The Cloud of Unknowing*, and illustrates the continuous popularity of *The Scale of Perfection* through a period of three centuries. Professor Crofts' presentation of John Donne as technician, rebel, and defeated coxcomb is refreshingly provocative. Mr. Louis MacNeice, in a concluding paper, emphasizes the importance attached to subject-matter by modern poets, particularly W. H. Auden and Stephen Spender—"more concerned with the Self than the Soul"—as distinct from their immediate predecessors the imagists and the surrealists.

B. E. C. DAVIS.

#### SHORT NOTICE

**A History of Modern Colloquial English.** By HENRY CECIL WYLD.  
Third Edition, with Additions. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1936.  
Pp. xviii + 433. 8s. 6d. net.

It is hardly necessary to do more than to offer a welcome to the third edition of this valuable book, which has, of course, long been the recognized authority on its subject. This new edition is in the main a "replika" reprint of the second with some added footnotes and the occasional insertion of a few lines in the text. There are also six appendices dealing with points requiring further discussion, attention being paid in particular to Milton's spellings and pronunciation in view of Miss Darbishire's recent work on the Morgan MS. of *Paradise Lost*, Book I; and there is a new "Alphabetical List of Sources." Perhaps, as the use of the "replika" process has enabled the price of the book to be brought down from the original guinea to 8s. 6d., we ought not to grumble, but I cannot help feeling that linguistic work of this kind, which must at the best be somewhat repellant in appearance, needs all the possible advantages which can be given by good typography and machining. To anyone to whom these things matter the inevitable imperfections of the process used, giving the effect of a bad impression from worn or inferior stereotype plates, the insertion of lines in different type from that of the body of the book in order to make corrections or additions, and the irregularity in page length due to these insertions, can hardly fail to produce a sense of irritation which will make it difficult to give the calm and concentrated attention to the matter of the book which it deserves and indeed requires.

R. B. McK.

## SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

AMERICAN SPEECH, Vol. XII., No. 3, October 1937—

Hypercorrect English (Robert J. Menner), pp. 168-78.

Avoidance of forms like "comin" for "coming" produces errors such as "chicking" and "capting" for "chicken" and "captain." Many other errors arise in a similar way by incorrect analogy.

BULLETIN OF THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY, Vol. 21, No. 2, October 1937—

Shakespeare's Comedies: the Consummation (H. B. Charlton), pp. 323-51.

Henry of Lancaster and his *Livre des Seintes Medicines* (E. J. F. Arnould), pp. 352-86.

ELH, Vol. 4, No. 3, September 1937—

Milton and the Paradox of the Fortunate Fall (Arthur O. Lovejoy), pp. 161-79.

The Epic Catalogue of *Paradise Lost* (Grant McColley), pp. 180-91.  
The list of the peers of Lucifer in Book I derived from Alexander Ross's *Pantheia*, 1653.

John Dolman (Lily B. Campbell), pp. 192-200.

Translator and contributor to *A Mirror for Magistrates*.

Chaucer's *Merchant's Tale* and Courtly Love (Margaret Schlauch), pp. 201-12.

The Scholarly Origin of the Elizabethan Revival (Earl Rivers Wasserman), pp. 213-43.

ENGLISH, Vol. I., No. 6, 1937—

The Publication of A. E. Housman's Comic Poems (G. Tillotson), pp. 485-93.

Polite Speech in the Eighteenth Century (W. Matthews), 493-511.

Dr. Johnson on Schools and Schoolmasters (G. Boas), pp. 537-49.

ENGLISCHE STUDIEN, Band 72, Heft 1, October 1937—

Strophische Überreste in den altenglischen Zaubersprüchen (F. P. Magoun, jr.), pp. 1-6.

The Name of Beowulf (Henry Bosley Woolf), pp. 7-9.

König Eadgars Tod († 975) (Max Förster), pp. 10-13.

Note in MS. Lambeth 204.

Das Hamlet-Problem (Max Priess), pp. 14-48.

Die Gerundialfügung mit und ohne Präposition in neueren Englisch (Johann Ellinger), pp. 49-57.

## ÉTUDES ANGLAISES, Vol. I., No. 5, September 1937—

A. E. Housman (M. Pollet), pp. 385-404.

Signification de Joyce (A.-M. Petitjean), pp. 405-17.

## — No. 6, November, 1937—

L'Amérique telle que l'ont vue les Romanciers Français (1917-1937)  
(J. Simon), pp. 498-520.HERRIGS ARCHIV FÜR DAS STUDIUM DER NEUEREN SPRACHEN, Band 172,  
1 u. 2 Heft, September 1937—

Waberloke (A. H. Krappe), pp. 1-10.

Analogues of the wall of flame by which the castle of the Valkyries was surrounded.

Deutschlands erste Theaterbauten (A. Dörrer), pp. 11-27.

Chaucer, der Freund des einfachen Mannes (Hans Marcus), pp. 28-41.

Die Rahmenerzählung von Morris' *Earthly Paradise* (Otto Löhmann),  
pp. 42-6.

Zu C. H. Herford's Gedächtnis (A. Brandl), p. 64.

Zu æ. blægttan=blöken, schreien (G. Linke), pp. 64-5.

## HISTORY, Vol. XXII., No. 86, September, 1937—

Notes on the Pronunciation of Medieval Latin in England (G. Herbert  
Fowler), pp. 97-109.THE HUNTINGTON LIBRARY QUARTERLY,<sup>1</sup> Vol. 1, No. 1, October 1937—The "Gentleman's Library" in Early Virginia: The Literary Interests  
of the First Carters (Louis B. Wright), pp. 3-61.Contents of the libraries of John Carter II (died 1690), and of Robert Carter  
(died 1732).Wordsworth and Coleridge Marginalia in a Copy of Richard Payne  
Knights' *Analytical Inquiry into the Principles of Taste* (Edna

Aston Shearer), pp. 63-99.

Notes probably written by Wordsworth at the dictation of Coleridge during  
the illness of the latter in 1808.

## LIBRARY, Vol. XVIII., No. 2, September 1937—

Juan de Vingles (Jean de Vingle), A Sixteenth-Century Book Illus-  
trator (Henry Thomas), pp. 121-76.

The Prymer in English (Edwyn Birchenough), pp. 177-94.

The Flye 1569 (Eustace F. Bosanquet), pp. 195-200.

Pictorial table of tides from an *Almanack*.The type-specimen books of Claude Lamesle and Nicholas Gando  
(A. F. Johnson), pp. 201-11.Christopher Smart, Richard Rolt, and *The Universal Visiter* (Claude  
Jones), pp. 212-4.

## MEDIUM ÆVUM, Vol. VI., No. 3, October 1937—

Alexander and the Water of Life (R. M. Dawkins), pp. 173-91.

<sup>1</sup> This replaces the *Huntington Library Bulletin*, which has ceased publication.



# SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 123

Thomas Sampson and the *Orthographia Gallica* (Ivor D. O. Arnold), pp. 193-209.

Rules for the writing of French compiled for the purpose of a secretarial course given by Sampson at Oxford in 1383.

The Lidwicings of *Widsith* (Kemp Malone), p. 213.

The tribal name *Lidwicingum* in l. 80.

On *Seafarer* 111-116 (Kemp Malone), pp. 214-5.

THE MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW, Vol. XXXII., No. 4, October 1937—

Milton's Schoolmasters (Arthur Barker), pp. 517-36.

Thomas Young and Alexander Gill.

Keats and Lucretius (John Henry Wagenblass), pp. 537-52.

Poetical and philosophical affinities. Thomas Creech's translation of Lucretius.

Some Elizabethan Tunes (Roy Lamson, Jr.), pp. 584-5.

"My Switzers" (John W. Draper), pp. 585-8.

*Hamlet*, iv. v. 97. Military status of Marcellus, Bernardo, and Francisco.

Wordsworth and the Horatian Spirit (Benj. Gilbert Brooks), pp. 588-93.

NEOPHILOLOGUS, Jaargang 23, Aflevering 1, 1937—

The Wooing of Olivia (John W. Draper), pp. 37-46.

"The Passing of Arthur" and "Ymadawiad Arthur," (G. J. Visser), pp. 46-52.

Comparison of poems by Tennyson and Professor T. Gwynn-Jones.

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 173, August 7, 1937—

A Third Thousand Notes on *N.E.D.* (G. G. Loane), pp. 94-6.

Continued August 21, pp. 129-31; September 4, pp. 168-70; September 18, pp. 204-5; October 2, pp. 236-40; October 16, pp. 274-7; October 30, pp. 308-12; November 13, pp. 345-9.

A Poem by John Wolcot (Peter Pindar) (T. O. Mabbott), pp. 97-8.

Believed to be hitherto unprinted.

August 14—

Two Notes on *The Merry Wives of Windsor* (H. W. Crundell), pp. 112-3.

(1) Early stage history; (2) Shakespeare and Etherege.

August 21—

Two Unpublished Letters of Vanbrugh (Howard P. Vincent) pp. 128-9.

August 28—

"Sir" Thomas Dunlop Wallace of Craigie (J. M. Bulloch), pp. 146-9.

Son of Burns's friend Mrs. Dunlop.

Dryden's Epigram on Milton ("Hibernicus"), pp. 149-50.

A Letter of Robert Burns (R. H. Heindel), p. 152.

Letter to the Earl of Glencairn, usually dated May 4, 1787, now first printed in full from the MS.

September 4—

Ben Jonson, Thomas Randolph, and *The Drinking Academy* (Fredson T. Bowers), pp. 166-8.

"Runaways' eyes" in *Romeo and Juliet* (H. R. Hoppe), pp. 171-2.  
Suggests emendation to "That runaways' ends may work."

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 173, September 11—

Thoughts on *The Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border* (J. L. Weir), pp. 182-7.

Allusions in Byron's Letters (R. G. Howarth), pp. 187-8.

Sources found.

The Date of *The Copeye of a Supplication made from poore Syon* (J.R.F.), p. 191.

Correct date between May and October 1587.

— September 18—

*The Taming of the Shrew* on the XVII-Century Stage (H. W. Crundell), p. 207.

— September 25—

The Attack on the Stage in the XVIII Century (F. T. Wood), pp. 218-22.

List of tracts for and against the stage.

James Fenimore Cooper in France, 1830-2 (N. F. Adkins), pp. 222-4.

Some doubtful points in *Macbeth* (David Baird), p. 224.

The Third Murderer in III. iv: the meaning of I. i: "When shall we three meet again."

— October 2—

Ben Jonson in the Provinces (E. L. Avery), p. 238.

Performances at Richmond, Twickenham, and Bristol in 1746-54.

— October 9—

Peter Pindar and Canning (F. R. Gale), pp. 255-7.

The Poetry of James Grahame, First Marquis of Montrose, 1612-50 (J. L. Weir), pp. 258-61.

Text of the poems from the earliest printed versions.

— October 16—

A New Letter of Charles Lamb (J. H. Birss), p. 278.

Note of a letter to John Britton, the antiquary.

— October 23—

The Summer Theatrical Seasons at Richmond and Twickenham, 1746-53 (E. L. Avery), pp. 290-4.

Continued October 30, pp. 312-15; November 6, pp. 328-32.

— October 30—

"Balloon" Tytler (J. L. Weir), pp. 311-12.

Eighteenth-century poet, miscellaneous writer, surgeon, and balloonist.

— November 6—

The Aurora Borealis ("Hibernicus"), 326-8.

Allusions in literature.

Popular Errors regarding George Canning (F. R. Gale), pp. 332-3.

## NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 173, November 13—

Samuel Bowden of Frome, Somerset (C. Rosenberg), pp. 344-5.

Addenda to *D.N.B.* article.

Towards a Bibliography of the Epitaph (J. L. Weir), pp. 349-50.

Continued November 20, p. 367.

## — November 27—

Owen Felltham of Great Billing (Jean Robertson), pp. 380-4.

New biographical information from Chancery documents.

The Bab Ballads by Titles (J. M. Bulloch), p. 387.

Addition to article in Vol. 172, pp. 362-67.

## PHILOLOGICAL QUARTERLY, Vol. XVI., No. 3, July 1937—

The Sources of 1 *Henry VI* as an Indication of Revision (Charles F. Denny), pp. 225-48.

English Travel Books, 1775-1825 (Wallace Cable Brown), pp. 249-71.

Bassanio, the Elizabethan Lover (Helen Penniton Pettigrew), pp. 296-306.

Dean Swift, Pope Innocent, and Oliver Wendell Holmes (Irving Linn), pp. 317-20.

## PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, Vol. LII., No. 3, September 1937—

Spenser's *View* and *Essex* (Rudolf B. Gottfried), pp. 645-51.

Light on the Dark Lady: a Study of Some Elizabethan Libels (Pauline K. Angell), pp. 652-74.

The Text of *Comus*, 1634-1645 (John S. Diekhoff), pp. 705-27.

Milton's Dialogue on Astronomy: the Principal Immediate Sources (Grant McColley), pp. 728-62.

Dr. Johnson on Oats and Other Grains (Lane Cooper), pp. 785-802.

Eighteenth-century English Reactions to the *Nouvelle Héloïse* (James H. Warner), pp. 803-19.

A Seventeenth-century French Source for Hurd's *Letters on Chivalry and Romance* (Victor M. Hamm), pp. 820-8.

Burns' Highland Mary (Robert T. Fitzhugh), pp. 829-34.

Nature and Imagination in Wordsworth's *Meditation upon Mt. Snowdon* (Newton P. Stallknecht), pp. 835-47.

Nemesis and Nathaniel Hawthorne (Oscar Cargill), pp. 848-61.

The Hound, the Bay Horse, and the Turtle-dove: a Study of Thoreau and Voltaire (Edith Peairs), pp. 863-9.

Swinburne's Mature Standards of Criticism (Ruth C. Child), pp. 870-9.

The Original of the *Ayenbite of Inwyt* (W. Nelson Francis), pp. 893-5.

The Brewbarret Interpolation in the York Play, the *Sacrificium Cayme* and *Abell* (Mendal G. Frampton), pp. 895-900.

Another Allusion to Costume in the Work of the "Wakefield Master"  
(John Harrington Smith), pp. 901-2.

In *Secunda Pastorum*: "looke my slefe that I steyll noght."

Marlowe's Role in Borrowed Lines (Mary Matheson Wells), pp. 902-5.

Elizabethan and Seventeenth-Century Play Manuscripts: Addenda  
(Alfred Harbage), pp. 905-7.

Eighteenth-Century Comic Opera Manuscript (R. W. Babcock),  
pp. 907-8.

The Symbolism of Shelley's *To a Skylark* (E. Wayne Marjarum),  
pp. 911-13.

STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXXIV., No. 4, October 1937—

Identification of Characters in Mulgrave's *Essay upon Satyr* (Maurice  
Irvine), pp. 533-51.

Wordsworth's *Prelude*: the Poetic Functions of Memory (Bennett  
Weaver), pp. 552-63.

Thomas Moore and English Interest in the East (Wallace Cable  
Brown), pp. 576-88.

Charles Kingsley and Science (Mary Wheat Hanawalt), pp. 589-611.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, August 7, 1937—

Holinshed and his Editors (Clarence Brownfield), p. 576.

Strongly Protestant bias not present in original edition.

A Friend of Spenser (C. B. Millican), p. 576.

Robert Salter, chaplain to the third Baron Sheffield.

Doune the Astronomer (W. Fraser Mitchell and M. F. Ashley-  
Montagu), p. 576.

Further references to letter by I. A. Shapiro of July 3, p. 492; Note by  
C. M. Coffin, September 18, p. 675.

Fulke Greville (F. A. Yates), p. 576.

Suggested origin of the name "Caelica."

— August 14—

Richard Lovelace (C. H. Wilkinson), p. 592.

Additional biographical information, etc.

Drayton and Chettle (Kathleen Tillotson), p. 592.

Allusions in a poem by John Fenton. Note by B. H. Newdigate, August  
21, p. 608; by Kathleen Tillotson, August 28, p. 624.

John Donne (I. A. Shapiro), p. 592.

Reply to letter by P. Legouis of July 31, p. 560. Cf. also August 7, p. 576.

— August 21—

Chatterton, Coleridge, and Bristol: "The Sacred River" (E. H. W.  
Meyerstein), p. 606.

The subterranean river in *Kubla Khan* ultimately suggested by the Avon at  
Bristol. Letter on this by F. W. Sypher, and reply by Mr. Meyerstein,  
August 28, p. 624.

Coleridge and the Soldier (L. Patton), p. 608.

Unpublished marginalia.

# SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 127

Crashaw and Andrewes (F. E. Barker), p. 608.

Date of portrait and of Crashaw's earliest printed verses. Note by K. N. Colville, August 28, p. 624.

## TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, August 28—

Moore in Wiltshire (A. G. Bradley), p. 624.

Thomas Moore's occupation of Sloperton Cottage. Further letters by W. M. Parker, October 16, p. 759; E. A. Sadler and W. Roberts, October 23, p. 783.

## September 4—

A *Hamlet* Emendation (Inez Scott), p. 640.

Suggests "ring" and "Wringing" for "wind" and "Running" in i. iii. 108-9.

Lady Mary Wortley Montagu's Fiancé (C. H. Collins Baker), p. 640.

Mr. Skeffinton, son of the third Viscount Massereene.

Little Nell (P. C. Kitchen), p. 640.

Letter from Dickens stating that her story was "wholly fictitious."

## September 11—

Poems by Johnson (J. Reading), p. 656.

Genuineness of "Epitaph on Sir Thomas Hanmer" and five other poems contributed to *The Gentleman's Magazine*, 1747.

Wordsworth and Theocritus (E. Casson), p. 656.

Horace Walpole: two unpublished letters (W. Forbes Gray), p. 660.

Letters to William Robertson the historian, May 30, 1777, and June 20, 1791.

## September 18—

Gainsborough and Smollett (W. Roberts), p. 675.

Further note by Mr. Roberts, September 25, p. 695, by L. Rice-Oxley, October 2, p. 715, by M. H. Grant, October 9, p. 735, by L. F. Powell, October 16, p. 759.

Montaigne and *Twelfth Night* (P. Allen), p. 675.

Suggestion that MOAI in *T.N.* II. v. 18 stands for Montaigne.

Byron's *Fare thee Well*: Unrecorded Editions (Davidson Cook), p. 680.

See article by G. Pollard on Pirated Collections of Byron, October 16, p. 764.

## September 25—

"And yet I knew a maid" (F. Christensen), p. 695.

Argues that the maid referred to in *The Prelude*, xi. 199 in the A text, was Mary Hutchinson.

## October 2—

Mary Elizabeth Braddon: born October 4, 1837 (Michael Sadleir), p. 711.

Note by M. Summers, October 9, p. 735.

The Pronunciation of Wriothesley (Charlton Hinman), p. 715.

Note by A. F. Pollard, October 9, p. 735.

Milton Autographs (Maurice Kelley), p. 715.

MSS. in the Public Record Office apparently containing corrections or notes in his hand.

W. Roscoe and Burns (Sydney Jeffery), p. 715.  
Letter from Roscoe (1796) referring to Burns's death.

**TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, October 9—**

R. L. Stevenson (Isobel Field), p. 735.  
Recollections of Stevenson. Note by Doris N. Dalglish, October 16,  
p. 759. *cf.* p. 783.  
*Noctes Ambrosianæ* (R. M. Wardle), p. 735.  
Writer of the initial number not W. Maginn.

**Oct. 16—**

Pirated Collections of Byron (Graham Pollard), p. 764.

**October 23—**

A Footnote to Boswell (K. A. Esdaile), p. 783.  
Epitaph of Edward Dilly, the bookseller.  
Keats and Monkhouse (E. de Selincourt), p. 783.  
Unpublished letter of Keats to T. Monkhouse.  
Missing Tudor Books on Farming (G. E. Fussell), p. 788.  
Attempt to identify the authorities cited in B. Googe's *Four Books of Husbandrie*, 1577.

**October 30—**

Southey's History of Portugal (M. H. Fitz Gerald), p. 803.  
Completeness of Kubla Khan (E. H. W. Meyerstein), p. 803.  
Marston's Drusus (H. W. Crundell), p. 803.  
Argues that *Romeo and Juliet* was revived in 1598 or thereabouts.

**November 13—**

The Walpole Letters (Stephen Gaselee), p. 871.  
*Cf.* November 20, p. 891.  
Cymbeline III. v. 70-4 (Henry Cuninghame), p. 871.  
Suggests emending "Then Lady, Ladies, Woman, from every one" to  
"Than all the ladies; and won from every woman."  
"Musæum Clausum" (J. S. Finch), p. 871.  
Sloane MS. 3413 does not contain a catalogue of Sir T. Browne's Museum,  
as has been stated.

**November 20—**

The Two Hyperions (Frederick Page), p. 891.  
Wordsworth in France (J. V. Logan), p. 891.  
Visit in 1793.  
"Golden Grove" (Elizabeth M. Mackenzie), p. 891.  
Significance of Jeremy Taylor's use of the title.  
Robert Southey and Miss Seton (I. Kyrle Fletcher), p. 896.  
Letter from Rosamund Brunel Gotch, November 27, p. 911.

**November 27—**

Drayton, Browne, and Wither (Kathleen Tillotson), p. 911.  
Richard Jefferies (S. J. Looker), p. 916.  
Bibliographical note on certain of his essays.

